

The Modern Language Association of America

REVOLVING FUND SERIES

VIII

HENRY HOWARD

EARL OF SURREY

*Approved for publication in the Revolving Fund Series  
The Modern Language Association of America*

H. D. AUSTIN

GEORGE R. HAVENS

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HENNING LARSEN

JOHN A. WALZ

*Committee of Award*

# HENRY HOWARD, EARL OF SURREY

BY  
EDWIN CASADY

NEW YORK  
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION  
OF AMERICA  
MCMXXXVIII

*Copyright, 1938, by*  
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Composed, Printed and Bound by  
The Collegiate Press  
George Banta Publishing Company  
Menasha, Wisconsin



*To*

Professor Gerald Sanders



## PREFACE

The object of this study of Surrey, which was undertaken at the suggestion of Professor Gerald Sanders, is to reinterpret the character of the man and of his poetry. In it I have attempted to distinguish clearly among the facts, the conjectures, and the fictions offered by former studies, to integrate all existing material on the subject, and to present the man and the poet from the point of view made possible by our increasing knowledge of the first half of the sixteenth century.

Its most valuable contribution to scholarship may seem to be the negative one of bringing to attention how completely the common conception of Surrey derives from questionable conjectures and fallacious traditions. In my opinion, however, its value lies in the evidence advanced that Surrey was not a "folish prowde boye," in the explanation offered of the influences which caused Surrey to act as he did, and in the accounts given of customs, manners, and practices in sixteenth-century England.

In any such study—to paraphrase a statement by Mr. M. R. Ridley in his study of Keats<sup>1</sup>—

it is ridiculous to be dogmatic; the only person who can know how an individual's mind works is the individual himself, and even he is probably none too clear about it. On the other hand, perpetual qualification becomes tedious. I hope therefore that anyone who reads this study will realize that any blunt statement concerning a man's motives or mental reactions should be read with a tacit qualification of "probably" or "one may conjecture," which in the interest of brevity and clarity is usually suppressed or placed in a footnote.

Moreover, in the interest of brevity and clarity, I have abbreviated many references,<sup>2</sup> modernized the punctuation of all quotations, conventionalized the spellings of proper names where necessary to prevent ambiguity, and changed all dates to New Style.

<sup>1</sup> *Keats' Craftmanship* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 106-107.

<sup>2</sup> A table of bibliographical abbreviations is given on pp. xi-xii.

To the Rhodes Trustees I am deeply grateful for the scholarship which enabled me to examine source materials in England relating to Surrey and to present, in 1931, a dissertation on Surrey to Oxford University. I must acknowledge, however, that further study has led me to question the commonly accepted interpretations of Surrey's character and actions, many of which I repeated in my Oxford dissertation, and to formulate the reinterpretation offered in the following pages.

Probably only those who have themselves made a study of sixteenth-century England will appreciate fully the extent to which I am indebted to the research of both past and present scholars. Everyone will, of course, recognize my indebtedness to Professor A. F. Pollard's published work; I am also indebted to Professor Pollard for the privilege of attending his seminar in problems of Tudor research and for many suggestions of possible sources of information pertaining to Surrey. I have found more help in other studies relating to Surrey than I am able to acknowledge specifically; to all of them am I indebted, and especially to the studies of George Frederick Nott and of Edmund Bapst. Anyone who examines carefully Nott's work on Surrey must admire, even marvel at, the comprehensiveness of the material which he succeeded in bringing together without the help of modern critical apparatus. To Professor Hoyt H. Hudson and to Professor Leicester Bradner I am grateful for reading my manuscript in progress and giving me much valuable advice. To the officials of the Bodleian Library, the British Museum, the Public Record Office, and the Huntington Library I am grateful for their unfailing courtesy in helping me to make use of their resources. To the many others who have contributed to this study I wish also to express my sincere thanks.

E. C.

*Brown University*  
*15 April, 1938*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	vii
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	xi
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	3
CHAPTER I: The House of Howard . . . . .	9
CHAPTER II: Birth, Boyhood, and Betrothal . . . . .	21
CHAPTER III: Companion of the King's Son . . . . .	38
CHAPTER IV: A Mind of His Own . . . . .	50
CHAPTER V: Scion of the Howards . . . . .	76
CHAPTER VI: Completing His Military Training . . . . .	102
CHAPTER VII: "Lieutenant General of the King" . . . . .	127
CHAPTER VIII: Recalled from Boulogne . . . . .	152
CHAPTER IX: To the Executioner's Block . . . . .	184
APPENDIX I: Contribution to English Literature . . . . .	222
APPENDIX II: The Tradition of Surrey's Love for Geraldine . . . . .	244
INDEX . . . . .	251



## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK

- Acts of P. C.: Acts of the Privy Council of England.* J. R. Dasent, editor. London: Public Record Office, 1890-1907.
- Arber: *Tottel's Miscellany.* Edward Arber, editor. London, 1920.
- Bapst: Edmond Bapst, *Deux gentilshommes-poètes de la cour de Henry VIII.* Paris, 1891.
- Berdan: John M. Berdan, *Early Tudor Poetry.* New York, 1920.
- Brenan & Statham: Gerald Brenan & E. P. Statham, *The House of Howard* [2 vols.; pagination consecutive]. London, 1907.
- Cal. of P. R.: Calendar of Patent Rolls.* London: Public Record Office, 1901-16.
- Campbell: William Campbell, *Materials for the History of Henry VII.* London, 1873-77.
- CHEL.: Cambridge History of English Literature.* New York and London, 1907-17.
- Dom. Cal.: Calendar of State Papers, Domestic.* London: Public Record Office, 1856-72.
- Garter: Register of the Most Noble Order of the Garter.* John Anstis, editor. London, 1724.
- Hall: Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre & Yorke.* Edition of London, 1809, unless otherwise indicated.
- Holinshed: Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland.* 4 parts. Edition of 1577 unless otherwise indicated.
- Kaulek: *Correspondance politique de MM. de Castillon et de Marillac.* Jean Kaulek, editor. Paris, 1885.
- L. & P.: Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of . . . Henry VIII.* Edition of London, 1862-1910, unless otherwise indicated.
- Lord Herbert: Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, *Henry VIII.* London, 1649.
- Memorials: Memorials of the Howard Family.* Henry Howard of Corby, editor. [N. P.], 1834.
- Nott: Volume I of *The Works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and of Thomas Wyatt, the Elder.* Geo. Fred. Nott, editor. 2 vols. London, 1815-16.

- Padelford: *Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey*. F. M. Padelford, editor; revised edition. Seattle, 1928.
- Sp. Cal.: Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*. London: Public Record Office, 1862-1916.
- S. P., Henry VIII: State Papers . . . of Henry VIII*. London: Public Record Office, 1830-52.
- Ven. Cal.: Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*. London: Public Record Office, 1864-1935.
- Weever: John Weever, *Ancient Funerall Monuments*. London, 1631.
- Wriothesley: Charles Wriothesley, *Chronicle*, 1485-1559. Camden Society, New Series, no. XI, XX. Westminster, 1875-77.



HENRY HOWARD  
EARL OF SURREY

## INTRODUCTION

In August, 1539, when the name of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, was mentioned to John Barlowe, Dean of Westbury and ardent adherent of the Reformation, he exclaimed, "It ys the most folish prowde boye that ys in Englande."

Although both of his companions on the journey to Slebech, in South Wales, were zealous Reformers and shared the Dean's hostility to the political and religious conservatism of the Howards, one of them, George Constantyne,<sup>1</sup> retorted ironically, "What, man, he hath a wife & a childe, & ye call hym boye?" Then, finding his irony wasted, he questioned directly the use of the phrase "folish prowde" and ridiculed it as equally inept.<sup>2</sup>

Soon after Surrey's execution, however, the point of view exemplified by Constantyne's refusal to take the Dean's remarks seriously began to be modified by misleading traditions. These traditions, accumulating authority by being repeated for century after century, gradually distorted the conception of Surrey's character and the interpretation of his actions until the justice of the Dean's phrase came to be, and continues to be accepted without question.

That Surrey, the active heir to the leadership of the old, conservative nobility, was "prowde" admits little doubt. But I am convinced that he can be considered "folish prowde" only by those who believe all men "folish" who choose to die rather than renounce their beliefs or their principles. To those who admit that there may be merit in justice as administered by Artegall and in courtesy as practiced by Sir Calidore, I wish to

<sup>1</sup> George Constantyne was a confidential agent and spy in the service of Thomas Cromwell.

<sup>2</sup> This conversation and that immediately below is quoted from "Instructions for my Lorde Privey Seale as towching the whole communication betwixt John Barlow, Deane of Westbury, Thomas Barlow Prebendary there, clerkys, and George Constantyne of Lawhaden, in their journey from Westbury vnto Slebech in Sowthwales"; printed in *Archaeologia*, XXIII (London, 1831), 56 ff.; where the date given is 19 August, 30 Henry VIII. But the marriage of Henry to Anne of Cleves was not seriously discussed until 1539.

suggest that history has misunderstood Surrey's character and conduct. If we forget tradition for the moment and reëxamine the ascertainable facts of Surrey's life, we find ourselves questioning the Dean's contention that Surrey at twenty-two years of age "exceedeth [in his pride]," as did Constantyne, who asked, "What then? He ys wise for all that, as I heare. And as for pride, experience will correcte [that] well inough. No mervell though, a yonge man, so noble a mans sonne & heyre apparante, be prowde; for we be to prowde ourselves without those qualities." Moreover, if we study the ascertainable facts of Surrey's life in the light of modern knowledge of his England, we find that in so far as he was free to do so he may have acted with sound judgment.

In examining Surrey's character and actions we must recall that at the beginning of the sixteenth century the English laity, nobles and commoners alike, knew too little of literature to be bound by literary traditions. Consequently, in his literary activities Surrey was free to accept what the Renaissance brought and to treat the material as he would. But freedom of religious opinion or of political action he did not have. Such matters were rigidly determined in the sixteenth century, even more than they are today, by the accident of one's birth. Surrey was the eldest son and heir of the Duke of Norfolk, leader of the old, conservative nobility and chief of the opponents of the Reformation during the reign of Henry VIII. His father being the defender of the traditional rights of England's peers and the ancient jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church, Surrey's birth placed upon him the duty of defending the prerogatives and privileges of the old nobility against the encroachments of the English Crown, and the religious training he received as a child bound him to respect papal authority. He was born when the time was out of joint. Cursed spite or no, his birth forced him to attempt to set his world aright.

After asserting that Surrey's pride was justified and that he "ys wise for all that," Constantyne reverted to the subject which the travellers had been discussing and continued,

But I wold wish that he [the young Earl] should be one to be sent

thider,<sup>3</sup> for that he shulde there be fully instructed in Gods worde and of [Protestant] experience. For if the Duke of Northfolke were as fully persuaded in it [the Reformation] as he ys in the contrary, he shuld do moch good, for he is an earnest man, a bold man, and a witty in all his matters.

"It ys trew & ye saye well in that," agreed the Dean, for every man in England at this time was familiar with the persons and the accomplishments of the members of the House of Howard, whose head was Thomas, third Duke of Norfolk, brother-in-law of Henry VII and uncle of Henry VIII. He was England's ablest military commander and had never failed to accomplish a martial commission. He was also "a true Courtier, and one that paid an external Obedience to the King's Will and Pleasure"<sup>4</sup> while retaining his own convictions and acting to forward his own interests when the opportunity offered. Henry inherited his father's earnestness, boldness, and aptitude in military affairs and was endowed with his family's hostility to the Reformation, its hate of the newly created nobles, and its opposition to the destruction of the privileges, as well as the persons, of the old nobility.

Contemporary records show that the Duke of Norfolk was wily and diplomatic—or crafty and artful—in his opposition to the Machiavellian methods by which Henry VIII and his "new men" increased and strengthened the powers of the throne at the expense of the Church and peers. Norfolk subordinated his principles to expediency, subjugating his inherited rights and privileges to the necessity of the moment. Avoiding direct conflict when the force of his personal and political enemies was irresistible, he temporized until able to mitigate their hostile power by intrigue. Like Henry VIII, he would enter openly and irrevocably into any political action only after he was assured of its success. The Duke's character can be explained by his childhood. While he was in his teens, the House

<sup>3</sup> To the Protestant court of the Duke of Cleves, as a pledge of Henry VIII's good faith in the negotiations for the marriage of England's King to Anne of Cleves.

<sup>4</sup> *Acta Regia*, or an account of . . . instruments published by Mr. Rymer's *Fœdera* (London, 1726-27), III, 343.

of Howard was in disgrace and suffered want. His grandfather had been killed, and his father imprisoned for three years and a half, because the Howards had openly resisted the Tudor claims to the Crown of England. The third Duke of Norfolk's childhood taught him to be circumspect.

Surrey's childhood was very different. At twelve years of age he had his own retinue. While in his teens he became a member of the royal household, the companion of the King's only son. As such he resided for a year at the French Court. Deference and honor were due his position, and he received both. Moreover, his education acquainted him with the idealism of medieval chivalry and the humanism of the Italian Renaissance. Instructed by such early influences, he seems to have asserted and defended forcibly all his rights, privileges, and prerogatives with as utter disregard of the power of his antagonists or the consequences to his person as did his Italian contemporary, Benvenuto Cellini. But Surrey was English, not Italian; Cellini was an artist, a citizen of an independent city, and a native of Italy which was a collection of disjointed principalities. Surrey was an English noble and a subject of a Tudor sovereign. While he lived the old social order was changing. If one wishes to view it so, Surrey's life exemplifies that, in such a state of transition, society often sacrifices its best men and their abilities in bringing forth a new order of human relationships. When the economic conditions caused the people of England to demand a strong, unified government, regardless of the despotic methods by which it was established and administered, no opposition could prevent the establishment of a strong monarchy. Surrey and all the forces opposing the rapid development of the absolute monarchical power of the Tudors were quickly eradicated in a period towards the close of which, as Professor A. F. Pollard has pointed out, Shakespeare wrote his play of *King John* without making the faintest allusion to Magna Carta—since enshrined in popular imagination as the palladium of the British Constitution—and at a time in which references to the Great Charter were as rare in parliamentary debates as in the pages of Shakespeare.

Surrey's life, in exemplifying the futility of resisting social

change, also argues that free will is a myth. Although psychology is, as yet at least, an inexact science, little doubt remains that every man's thoughts and every man's actions are largely predetermined by his birth, his environment, and his education. Surrey could not but resist the Reformation in England. Even if someone had told him of an hypothesis now widely accepted—that it is always futile to resist religious, political, and social evolutions which are the result of changing economic conditions—his attitude and actions could not have been different. The obligation to resist the Reformation was placed upon him by his birth, for every man is the slave of his birthright—whether his slavery springs from his struggle to obtain and to defend his inheritance, or from his reaction against what it offers. Surrey was born with the blood of kings in his veins before the code of chivalry and feudalism had entirely lost its force in England. Several of his ancestors had married into the royal houses of England and of France. Two of his forebears were of the royal families. As he was born the heir apparent of the foremost exponent of the ancient hereditary rights, privileges, and prerogatives of England's peers and of the papacy, Surrey's birth created him the defender of the old order and determined the environment and the education which were to prepare him to assume this duty.

Committed to the defense of his birthright during the reign of Henry VIII, Surrey's life was in almost constant danger. Heir to the Dukedom of Norfolk and future head of the House of Howard when the executioner's axe was removing the heads of England's highest peers, when every person whose abilities constituted a threat to the absolutism of the Tudor Crown conveniently died or lost his head, Surrey could not live long. We are told that death is incorporate in birth. Surrey could not—even had he acted far otherwise than he did—escape the death which destiny had incorporated in his. His heritage, in addition to high position, included great personal abilities, which a reëxamination of the ascertainable facts of his life seems to indicate he used well in his political and military, as well as in his literary, activities. A Tudor could not fail to notice such qualities. And Henry VIII did not fail to acknowl-

edge Surrey's admirable qualities by the customary method of acknowledging the abilities of those who opposed his Majesty's Will. Henry VIII—or those who could stamp the royal signature of an unconscious king to documents—sent Henry, Earl of Surrey, to the executioner's block on Tower Hill nine days before death claimed the corpulent body of the first English king habitually addressed as "Your Majesty."

## CHAPTER I

### THE HOUSE OF HOWARD

Surrey was the heir of the head of the House of Howard during the reign of Henry VIII. To understand his character and to appreciate the motives which determined his conduct we must have some knowledge of the history of the House of Howard—we must recognize the eminence of the house at this time and know something of the means by which this family had attained, and tried to maintain, its power and influence.

The origin of the Howard family is obscure. Harvey,<sup>1</sup> Clarendieux king-at-arms in the reign of Elizabeth, attempted to trace the family to Auber, Earl of Passy, whose grandson, Roger Fitz-Valerine, came to England with the Norman invasion. Henry Lilly, Rouge dragon, rejected this Norman origin and endeavored to substitute a lineage from the Saxons. The Duke of Oslac in the reign of King Edgar is the progenitor of the Howards whom Lilly cites in his *Genealogie of the Princelie familie of the Howards exactly deduced in a right line from the xvth yeere of the raigne of King Edgar, sole Monarch of England in the year of our redemption 970 (before the Norman Conquest 96 years) to this present 14th yeere of the raigne of our dread Sovereigne Charles, . . . MDCXXXVIII*.<sup>2</sup> Although the manuscripts of these two genealogists are beautifully illuminated, both lineal trees are spurious—their only value is to increase the number of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century genealogies which offer evidence that fictitious inventions of illustrious origin are not confined to modern times. Mr. R. B. Maxse, of Brasenose College, Oxford, whose comprehensive genealogies of the great families of England are as yet unpublished, has kindly provided the authentic genealogical table here given.

The House of Howard first attained national importance sufficient to furnish documentary remains through the person of Sir William Howard, who died in 1309. Rising to great

<sup>1</sup> *Harleian Miscellany*, VI (London, 1810), p. 421 (note 7).

<sup>2</sup> This MS. is now at Arundel Castle.





eminence as a lawyer in the reign of Edward I, he became (if not the Chief Justice) one of the chief justices of Common Pleas.<sup>3</sup> His home was in East Wynch, a small village in west Norfolk, some five miles from the ancient port of King's Lynn. This is the first known residence of the Howards.<sup>4</sup>

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the members of the Howard family augmented their patrimonies by public service. By matrimony they raised their positions even more substantially, for the descendants of Sir William Howard chose their wives astutely. Though each successive union added something to the name and fortune of the family, foremost in importance of the Howard's matrimonial alliances was that of Sir Robert Howard (d. 1436). By marrying Margaret, daughter and co-heiress of Thomas Mowbray,<sup>5</sup> he firmly established the Howards as one of the most influential families of England and gained the legal right to bear the royal arms upon the Howard escutcheon.

The eldest son of this union of the Howards and the Mowbrays, Sir John Howard, was born about 1420-1422.<sup>6</sup> He became Lord Howard in the tenth year of Edward IV<sup>7</sup> and two years later was elected Knight of the Garter.<sup>8</sup> For services to the crown, he was created Duke of Norfolk and Earl Marshall of England in 1483,<sup>9</sup> the first year of Richard III's reign. His eldest son, Thomas,<sup>10</sup> was created Earl of Surrey at the same time.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. of P.R.*, Edw. I, 1292-1301 (London, 1895), III, 319 & *ad lib.* "In or about the reign of Henry VII a figure of him kneeling in his robes with the legend 'Pray for the soul of William Howard, chief justice of England,' was inserted in one of the stained-glass windows in the church of Long Melford, Suffolk. He does not seem, however, to have held the office of chief justice"; *D.N.B.*, XXVIII, 77.

<sup>4</sup> Weaver, p. 842; *Memorials*, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> This Thomas Mowbray, who died in 1399, was the first Duke of Norfolk of the name Mowbray. He was a descendant of Edward I, through Thomas de Brotherton, illegitimate son of that king. To Thomas de Brotherton and his descendants, Edward I had granted the right to quarter his (the king's) arms upon his escutcheon. And "in 1394 the Arms of Edward the Confessor were confirmed to him [Thomas, Lord Mowbray] and a crest assigned by patent. [Patent Rolls, 17 Rich. II, pt. 1, m. 2]"; James Dalloway, *Heraldic Inquiries* (London, 1793), p. 93. This is the source of Surrey's right to bear these royal arms.

<sup>6</sup> *Memorials*, p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Garter*, II, 185.

<sup>9</sup> On June 28; *Cal. of P.R.*, I Rich. III, pt. 1, m. 18.

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Howard, born 1444, the son of Sir John Howard by his first wife, Catherine, da. of William, Lord Moleyns.

Two years after receiving his title, John, Duke of Norfolk, was killed at the Battle of Bosworth Field while continuing his services to the crown of England worn by Richard III. This battle ended the War of the Roses by destroying the last of the Plantagenet kings and placing the sceptre in the grasp of the first of the Tudors, Henry VII. Thomas, Earl of Surrey, was taken prisoner on Bosworth Field after having fought valiantly until the battle was ended by the death of both his father and his king. Forced to surrender, this Earl of Surrey was brought a prisoner before Henry Tudor, who reproached him for having fought in the cause of "an usurper," as the victorious Tudor then dubbed the dead Richard III. To the accusation Surrey is reported to have replied, "Sire, he was my crowned King. Let the authority of Parliament place the Crown on that stake and I will fight for it; so would I have fought for you, had the same authority placed the Crown on your head."<sup>11</sup>

Although records of this incident vary, this version of the words of Henry Howard's grandfather epitomizes the policy of the Howards during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. During the fifteenth century the Howards had become one of the most eminent families in England. Their position was dependent upon established authority and the maintenance of the *status quo*; established authority was maintained by the crown. Consequently, the Howards always supported the crown, and sought to attain their ends by influencing the actions of the wearer of the crown.

ii. Henry VII, having slain Richard III and seized the sceptre by force of arms, had to be circumspect. No English monarch since William I had ascended his throne with less hereditary right, and he realized that his seat there could be made secure only by establishing peace and economic prosperity; for such conditions could not fail to establish the rule of even the Tudors in the hearts of the English people.

Not at once, however, could the first Tudor eradicate the disruptive forces which for thirty years had "fill'd the Realm with Blood and Desolation, and . . . [taken] away the Lives of

<sup>11</sup> Cf. William Camden, *Remaines* (London, 1614), p. 283.

near 100,000 Men, and 80 Princes of the Blood."<sup>12</sup> During the first fifteen years of his reign he had to seek means of placating the opposition of the powerful nobility and of winning the peers individually to his cause while he destroyed the persons or subdued the support of other claimants to the throne.

At his first parliament Henry VII revoked the title and estates of the dead Duke of Norfolk.<sup>13</sup> This parliament also attainted the Earl of Surrey, who had been confined in the Tower of London shortly after he was taken prisoner. But Henry VII was politic. Having thus destroyed the Howards' power to oppose him, he spared the life of this Earl of Surrey, apparently in hope that he might procure for his crown the services of the family whose attitude he had heard this Howard express on Bosworth Field.

Henry VII's application of his policy of leniency did obtain for him the services of the Howards. After Parliament had sanctioned the Tudor possession of the crown the Earl of Surrey admitted the claim of possession. He then gained Henry VII's confidence in his admission by his wise refusal to escape from imprisonment when he was given an excellent opportunity to do so. As John Weever has recorded the event:

Thafforseid Erle [of Surrey] hurte and takyn vpon the feld [of Bosworth, was] put in the Tower of London, by kynge Henry the vii. and ther contynued thre yeerys and an halfe. In whiche tyme of his beyng in the Tower, the same kynge Henry had a felde wyth the Erle of Lyncolne in Notyngham Shire, besydys Newarke [June, 1487]: and the leefetenant of the Tower came to the seid Erle and proffered to hym the keyes to goo out at his plesure; and he answered hym ageyne, that he wolde not deperte thens vn to suche tyme as he that commaunded hym thither shuld commaunde hym out ageyn, whiche was kynge Henry the vii, but charged the leffetenant vpon hys alligeaunce yf the kynge war on lyue to bryng hym ther as the kynge was, to thentente he myght do his Grace seruyce, and after that for the true and feithfull seruyce that the seid kynge Henry herd of him doon to his other Prynce; and also that he sawe hymselfe he dide on Bosworth feld, and for the grete

<sup>12</sup> *Acta Regia*, or an account of . . . instruments . . . published in Mr. Rymer's *Fœdera* (London, 1726-27), III, 26 (note): which continues, "but upon consulting the Genealogical Table of Edward III's Posterity, this last Number will appeare too much exaggerated."

<sup>13</sup> Campbell, II, 420.

preyse and truth that he herd of hym whills he was prisoner, and that he wold nat, thoughe he had liberty, come out of the Tower atthe Erle of Lyncolnes feld, he toke hym out to his presence, and to be aboute his own person.<sup>14</sup>

Thomas Howard was released from the Tower early in 1489.<sup>15</sup> The act of attainder against him was removed by Parliament in March of the same year. This action restored to Thomas Howard his former title of Earl of Surrey, but it did not restore to him his confiscated estates.<sup>16</sup> Of necessity, Thomas, Earl of Surrey, soon began to devote his military ability to the service of the crown. By his military achievements he won greater and greater honors from Henry VII, becoming High Treasurer of England in 1501.<sup>17</sup> The honors he gained, however, were of slight financial assistance, for the monetary benefits which the offices he held normally conveyed were carefully withheld from him, and only very, very slowly did the Tudors restore to the Howards their forfeited lands and estates. Not for twenty-five years were they permitted to escape from the restraint to which their financial difficulties had subjected them.

iii. The perfidy of James IV of Scotland—who, in common with all monarchs of his time, kept his political agreements only so long as he thought it politic to do so—finally enabled

<sup>14</sup> Weever, p. 835.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*; Brenan & Statham, p. 71, gives the date as January, 1488-89. Bapst, p. 147, states that Surrey was released in 1486, but cites no authority. I believe that he has construed the "special pardon to Thomas, earl of Surrey" (*Cal. of P.R.*, 1 Henry VII, pt. 3, m. 12(16)) of 1486 to be a release, which it is not.

<sup>16</sup> Campbell, II, 420, "3 Mar. 1489. 1. Petition exparte Thomas, late earl of Surrey, to the king and parliament holden 13 Feb. last, praying for the repeal and making void of the act of attainder, passed in the parliament of 7 Nov., 1 Hen. VII, against John, duke of Norfolk, and Thomas, earl of Surrey; and further praying that the act of annulment and restitution extend not to any honor but the earldom of Surrey, or to any other lands than those which the said earl of Surrey had in right of his wife, or to any of the lands which John, earl of Oxenford, and Giles, lord Dawberrey, have by the present king's patent, or to such lands as (had it not been for the said attainder) would have descended to the said Thomas by any other ancestor than the said John, duke of Norfolk. 2. Assents of the commons and of the king to this petition. 3. Act passed in the last parliament holden."

<sup>17</sup> *Cal. of P.R.*, 16 Henry VII, pt. 2, m. 11(11): 25 June, 1501, the Earl of Surrey was created "treasurer of the Exchequer from 16 June last."

the Howards to reëstablish their eminence at its former height. During the summer of 1513, Henry VIII went to the Continent to conduct a campaign in person against the French. James IV was Henry VIII's brother-in-law and at this time was bound by treaty not to go to war against him. Nevertheless, while Henry was in France the Scots, led by James himself, poured over the Border to attack England. But England was prepared and waiting. The Howards had remained at home to defend Henry VIII's domains from such an attack; and under the command of the Earl of Surrey and his eldest son, also named Thomas, the English almost annihilated the Scottish expedition on Flodden Field, September 9, 1513. James IV himself "was slain within a spear's length of Surrey."<sup>18</sup>

By destroying such a large part of the Scottish forces, the leadership of the Howards disrupted Scotland's military strength, dealt the Scottish crown a decisive blow from which it never fully recovered, and advanced the circumstances which were to lead to the union of England and Scotland. In acknowledgement of the victory, the title of Duke of Norfolk was recreated and bestowed upon the Earl of Surrey on February 1, 1514.<sup>19</sup> His eldest son, Thomas,<sup>20</sup> was created Earl of Surrey by the same patent. Moreover, Henry VIII also conferred upon the new Duke of Norfolk twenty-six manors and granted to him and his male heirs the honorable augmentation to their heraldic shield of "an escutcheon *or*, a demi-lion rampant, pierced through the mouth with an arrow, within a double tressure flory and counterflory gules."<sup>21</sup> This augmentation, being a part of the royal arms of Scotland, was granted to the Howards as a perpetual commemoration of the Battle of Flodden Field. The stain which the Battle of Bosworth had placed

<sup>18</sup> *L. & P.*, I, 4441.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 4694 & 4695. Not until 14-15 Charles II (1674-75), however, was the original precedence held by John, first Howard Duke of Norfolk, restored by act of parliament; consequently in contemporary records Thomas (d. 1524) is referred to as the first duke and Thomas (d. 1554) as the second. Throughout I have used the modern designation.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas Howard, 1474-1554, was the son of Thomas, second Howard Duke of Norfolk by his first wife, Elizabeth, da. of Sir Frederick Tileny. In 1524 this Thomas became the third Howard Duke of Norfolk.

<sup>21</sup> Brenan & Statham, p. 102; cf. *L. & P.*, I, 4694.

on the House of Howard was completely wiped away, and—what was more important—again the Howards had a steady source of income.

iv. While striving to reinstate their influence and to reëstablish their fortunes by military services the Howards did not neglect to make advantageous marriages. Lord Howard, the eldest son of the Earl of Surrey, had been affianced to Lady Anne Plantagenet early in the reign of Richard III.<sup>22</sup> In 1495 Henry VII graciously permitted Lord Howard to marry Lady Anne. She was the sister of Henry VII's own wife, daughter of Edward IV, and great-great-granddaughter of Edward I. An indenture of the covenants of this marriage was made 12 February, 1495.<sup>23</sup> On 16 October following, a bill was passed securing certain slight settlements to the two parties.<sup>24</sup> Although the dowry of Lady Anne Plantagenet was negligible, by this marriage Lord Howard—the future third Duke of Norfolk and father of Henry, Earl of Surrey—became the brother-in-law of Henry VII and the uncle of Henry VIII.

There were several children by this marriage, but not one of them lived to reach maturity. The last died in 1508.<sup>25</sup> The death of the mother, Lady Anne, followed shortly afterwards, probably in 1512. The last known mention of her as living was made 22 November, 1511.<sup>26</sup>

Thomas, as yet merely Lord Howard, became a childless widower when he was almost forty years of age. Keenly aware of his duty to beget sons, he looked about for a wife who would bear him children and presently selected Lady Elizabeth Stafford, a young girl of excellent family and large estates. She was the daughter of Edward, Duke of Buckingham,<sup>27</sup> and of

<sup>22</sup> G. Buck, *Richard III*; printed in Kennet's *Complete History of England* (London, 1719), p. 574.

<sup>23</sup> Tho. Madox, *Formulare Anglicanum* (London, 1702), pp. 109-110.

<sup>24</sup> Nott, p. v.

<sup>25</sup> Henry Lilly's *Genealogie* . . . contains the following: "Lord Thomas Howard died yong sans issue, 1508, and [was] buried without Lambhith, and three other [unnamed] children [died] sans issue." See also Nott, p. vii.

<sup>26</sup> Nott, p. vii.

<sup>27</sup> By his father descendant of Edward III.

his wife, Lady Eleanor Percy.<sup>28</sup> Although exact records of the date of this marriage are lacking,<sup>29</sup> we know that it took place very soon after the death of Lord Howard's first wife, for shortly after Easter, 1513, several documents refer to the Lady Elizabeth as the wife of Lord Thomas Howard.<sup>30</sup>

The duties assigned to him by his king caused Thomas Howard (Earl of Surrey after February, 1514) to be separated frequently from his wife. In the absences of the Earl, the Countess of Surrey remained at Tendring Hall, in Suffolk, or visited at one of the residences of her father-in-law. During the first twelve years of her marriage she presented her husband with five children.<sup>31</sup> As the names of only three of these have been preserved, it may be assumed that the other two died young.<sup>32</sup> The three were: Henry, who became known as Earl of Surrey when his father came into the dukedom in 1524; Thomas, created Viscount Bidon by Queen Elizabeth in 1558; and Mary, who in 1533 married Henry Fitzroy, natural son of Henry VIII, and thus became the Duchess of Richmond.

v. The original causes of the conjugal difficulties which arose between the parents of Henry Howard are uncertain. After the difficulties of their relationship had led to their living absolutely apart—an event which occurred several years after her husband fell heir to the dukedom in 1524—the Lady Elizabeth Stafford declared that she had resented her marriage to a Howard because at the time she was in love with Ralph Ne-

<sup>28</sup> Da. of Henry Percy, 4th Earl of Northumberland.

<sup>29</sup> Bapst, p. 151, sets the date of this marriage in the spring of 1512, but cites no authority. The only record which I can find from which he might deduce this date is one of the letters of the Duchess of Norfolk to Cromwell (B.M., Cotton MS. Titus, B.I., 390), which *L. & P.* assigns to the year 1537; here the Duchess wrote, "I have ben hys wyfe xxv yeres." Without further evidence I should interpret this as "about xxv yeres," for the Duchess is not noted for exactitude in her statements.

<sup>30</sup> Nott, p. vii.

<sup>31</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Titus, B.I., 390.

<sup>32</sup> Bapst, p. 153, "*Henry était le troisième des cinq enfants.*" He gives the names of the first two as Lady Muriel and Lady Catherine, but cites no authority. As there were at this time infants of these names in other branches of the Howard family, it may be, though Skelton does mention in his *Garlande of Laurell* an infant Lady "Mirriel" (as well as an infant Lady Elizabeth), that Bapst has assigned these incorrectly to Thomas, Earl of Surrey.



ville,<sup>33</sup> who became the fourth Earl of Westmorland. The dates of the respective births<sup>34</sup> of the two persons supposedly involved, however, cause even the most credulous to regard the lady's statements concerning this love affair with scepticism.

Any feeling of resentment which Lady Elizabeth held towards her husband and the Howards was, perhaps, intensified by the trial and condemnation for treason of her father, Edward, Duke of Buckingham. The Duke of Norfolk was forced by Henry VIII to preside at this trial, held on 13 May, 1521.<sup>35</sup> Buckingham was found guilty by the jury of peers, who followed their king's wishes in the matter. Although it was said that Norfolk wept as he did so,<sup>36</sup> he had to pronounce the sentence of death upon his daughter-in-law's father.

To discern the true causes and motives in a personal quarrel and to assign responsibility is always difficult, but regardless of the provocation, Lady Elizabeth's later accusations—after she had become the Duchess of Norfolk—against her husband, and her attitude when her husband and her eldest son were being tried for treason<sup>37</sup> suggest that she had inherited Hotspur's temper and probably was at little pains to make pleasant her relationship with her husband and household. And it is almost impossible to accredit many of the cruelties with which the Duchess charged her husband in her letters to Cromwell. Absolute disbelief of one of her accusations leads one to doubt the veracity of the others. Her statement that the Duke treated her with such cruelty when she was in childbed is incredible, even if we did not have the Duke's convincing denial of the charge. He wrote to Cromwell:

My Veray Gode lord, it is come to my knowlege that my wilfull wiff is come to London and hath be w<sup>t</sup> you, Intendyng to come to me to London. My lord, I assewre you as long as I lyve I well never come in her company vnto the tyme she hath furst wryten to me that she hath untrewly slandered me In wryting and saying that

<sup>33</sup> She reiterates this in her letters to Cromwell; B.M., Cotton MS., Titus, B.I; printed in Nott, appendices XXVII-XXXI.

<sup>34</sup> Westmorland was born in 1499. According to her own statement Lady Elizabeth was born in 1494; *D. N. B.* gives the date of her parents' marriage as 1500; either date supports my statement.

<sup>35</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 111; *L. & P.*, III, 1284.

<sup>36</sup> Hall, p. 624.

<sup>37</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 562.

when she had be In chyld-bed ij nyghts and a day of my doghter of richmond I shuld draw her out of her bed by the here of the hed abouts the howse and w<sup>t</sup> my dagar geue her a wonde In the hed. My gode lord, if I proue not by witnes, and that w<sup>t</sup> many honest p<sup>e</sup>sonys, that she had the skar In her hed xv moneths before she was delyuerd of my seid doghter, and that the same was cutt by a surgeon of London for a swellng she had In her hed of drawng of ij tethe, never trust my word after. Reportyng me to yor gode lordship, whether I shuld play the fole or no to put me In her danger that so falsly woll slander me and so wilfully styk therby. Sewerly I thynk ther is no man on lyve that wold handle a woman In child bed of that sort; nor for my part wold not so haue done for all that I am worth. Finally, my lord, I requyre you to send to her In no wise to come wher I am, for the same shuld not only put me to more troble than I haue (wheroff I haue no nede) but myght geve me occasion to handle her otherwise then I haue done yet. If she furst wright to me confessyng her fals slander, and therepon seue to the kyngs highnes to make an ende, I woll never refuse to do that his maieste shall comāde me to-do. But before assewredly never. And thus hertly fare ye well.<sup>38</sup>

Even without the Duke's denial, it is impossible to believe that the man who so ardently wanted legitimate offspring would, if only for that selfish reason, so jeopardize their well-being.

Although the wrongs which the Duchess suffered hitherto would seem to be largely imagined, if any of her statements are to be accepted the Duke gave his wife an actual cause for complaint about 1526. At this time he took as his mistress a lady in his own household, one Bess Holland. But again the vehemence of the Duchess leads to some doubt of her veracity. She charges that Bess Holland was "but a churles doyster," "a drab who was butt washer of my nurserie viij yeeres." Actually Elizabeth Holland was of the family of Lord Hussey of Sleaford and the daughter of John Holland of Hartwell Hall, chief steward and afterwards trustee to the Duke of Norfolk.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, the Duchess declares in writing to Cromwell:

I would not be contented to suffer the harlotts that bound me to be styll In my own house. They bound me and pynnacullit me, and sat on my brest tyll I spit blode. . . . Another cawce, he [Norfolk]

<sup>38</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Titus B.I, 394 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Brenan & Statham, p. 158.

sett hys women to bynde me tyll blode come out att my fyngars endes, and pynnacullit me, and satt on my brest tyll I spit blode; and he never ponsched them; and all thys was done for Bess Holand sake.

Whether or not there is any truth in these accusations, the domestic difficulties of the Duke and Duchess of Norfolk led to their separation in 1534. From this time they lived apart and the Duchess sought to revenge herself upon her husband while proclaiming her wrongs to the court.<sup>40</sup>

Such conditions in the household in which Henry Howard passed his earliest years could not fail to have had an influence upon him. The woman who could have attempted to make a martyr of herself in such a manner as her letters demonstrate would not have been at pains to conceal from her children the difficulties of her relations with their father, even if such concealment had been possible. The turmoil of this household, which during Henry Howard's boyhood contained both his mother and his father's mistress, was probably responsible for Surrey's later hate of such illicit relationships, his steadfast devotion to his wife, and his own avoidance of liaisons in a time when monarchs acknowledged their mistresses and bestowed honors upon their illegitimate offspring, when monks kept women in the monasteries and occasionally lived openly with them, when even the popes surrounded themselves with concubines and one pope was reputed to have committed incest.

<sup>40</sup> Quotations in the paragraph from the Duchess's letters to Cromwell, cited above.

## CHAPTER II

### SURREY'S BIRTH, BOYHOOD, AND BETROTHAL

Sir Henry Howard is always styled Earl of Surrey, but he had no legal right to be designated so. This is a courtesy title only.<sup>1</sup> When his father succeeded to the Dukedom of Norfolk in 1524, the Duke's second title, Earl of Surrey passed by custom to his eldest son. In both official and private records after this time Henry Howard is always referred to as "The Earl of Surrey" or "My Lord of Surrey." Nevertheless, having been executed before his father's death, he never possessed a coronet in his own right; although both his sire and his son were dukes of Norfolk, he was never actually a peer of England.

No record is known of the exact date or place of the birth of this eldest son of the third Duke of Norfolk. As the official recording of births, marriages, and deaths by the parish churches was not instituted in England until 1538, probably no public record of his birth was made. Upon inconclusive evidence, various writers have placed the date from 1516 to 1520. The more acceptable of the conjectures are based upon a portrait of Surrey now at Arundel Castle, which M. A. Tierney<sup>2</sup> has described as follows:

Whole length, standing under an arch, and resting with the right hand upon a broken pillar. The Earl is drest in a close suit of black richly embroidered with silver, and wears the Garter; the imposts of the arch are supported by two female figures, each holding an emblazoned shield, one with the arms of De Brotherton, son of Edward the first, the other with those of France and England quarterly. Above the arch, the letter H is upheld by two Angels: round its front are inscribed the words "*ANNO·DNI·1546·AETATIS·SVE·29·*" And on the pedestal of the broken column the motto "*SAT SVPER EST*" appears.

<sup>1</sup> This fact explains why Surrey could be tried for treason in 1547 before a common jury, whereas his father could be tried only before the House of Lords; see p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> *The History and Antiquities of the Castle and Town of Arundel* (London, 1834), I, 90. (My transcription of the inscribed words.)

The countenance of the Earl in the portrait is thought to express indignation and melancholy.

The plate on this portrait says that it is by "Wm. Strete." Although there have been some attempts to question the authenticity of both the plate and the inscriptions, Strype's *Ecclesiastical Memorials*<sup>3</sup> contains a record which proves that "Gillim Stretes" did paint a portrait of the Earl of Surrey in 1546. Moreover, in the Public Record Office<sup>4</sup> is a letter written by Surrey to his servant which seems to support the inscription. In this letter Surrey wrote:

Hugh Ellys, it will be iij or iiij days or Catelyn com, who shall bryng yow money. I pray delyver this [enclosed] letter w<sup>t</sup> all spede to Mrs. Hevingham, whom yew shall fynde at heromes Cheltons [Jerome Shelton's] howse in London, or els will be ther w<sup>th</sup> in iiij days. Comawnd the paynter to leve ow<sup>t</sup> the tablet wher my Lord off Richemond<sup>ss</sup> picture shuld stand, ffor I will have nothyng ther, nor yet the tablet, but all dowbet.<sup>5</sup> ffrom Kenyngale this Wedensday, H. Surrey.

On the back of the letter is written, "Delyver this letter to none but her own handes," and beneath in Sir Richard Southwell's hand,<sup>6</sup>

Yt maye please your good Lordshippez to examyn M<sup>es</sup> Henygham, late Marye Shelton, of theeffect of th'earle of Surrey his lettre sent unto her; for yt ys thowght that menyne secrettes hathe passed between them before her maryag and sethens.

This letter has not been dated exactly. In the Public Record Office it is bound up with other documents of 7 August, 1546. As the letter is inscribed "this Wedensday" and 7 August, 1546, fell on Saturday, that date can not be exact. Sir Richard Southwell's notation on the back, however, indicates that the attempt was made to use the letter against Surrey when the Privy Council was gathering evidence to convict him of treason; also, Mary Shelton did not become Mrs. Hevingham until late in 1545 or early in 1546. This supports the belief that the letter

<sup>3</sup> (London, 1721), II, 494.

<sup>4</sup> P.R.O., Henry VIII, S.P. 1/223, fol. 36.

<sup>5</sup> "Daubed over."

<sup>6</sup> L. & P., XXI, i, 1426. (My transcription of Surrey's letter; Southwell's comment from L. & P.)

was written in 1546, probably in the late summer or early autumn, when Surrey was at Kenninghall.

It would seem that the command to the painter in Surrey's letter refers to the portrait at Arundel Castle. The tablet in the base of the broken pillar on which Surrey is leaning was undoubtedly intended to contain something other than it does; although the rest of the pillar is very light in color, this rectangular space has been daubed over with dark paint. It is "all dowbet." The Duke of Richmond was Surrey's dearest friend, who died just when he and Surrey were reaching manhood. The symbolism suggested by a portrait of Richmond painted on the base of the broken column upon which Surrey is leaning offers a very probable explanation of the meaning of Surrey's command to the painter.

The motto now inscribed over the obliterated tablet, "SAT SVPER EST," may refer to the death of Surrey's friend as well as to Surrey's recall from Boulogne, which has been suggested to explain Surrey's second son's letter containing the statement, "Wherefore, if the dew of my devotion may be drawn up by the beams of your remorse (pity), 'Sat Superest,' as once my father [Surrey] wrote on the breach of a distressed hope."<sup>7</sup>

If the evidence of this letter is accepted to verify the inscribed date on the portrait, the portrait was painted in the summer or autumn of 1546. This makes it possible to compute that Henry Howard was born in 1517. Evidence discovered by G. F. Nott indicates that his birth took place in the spring of that year, for he found

a curious household book . . . containing an exact account of the expenses of the Earl of Surrey's family, from his going to live at Tendring Hall, in 1513, until the time of his father's death in 1524. From that book it appears that the Earl of Surrey passed the spring and summer months at Tendring Hall; and that he moved regularly on the 29th of October to Hunsdon, which he made his winter residence. He was himself frequently absent on public business; and the Countess was occasionally absent during her

<sup>7</sup> As printed in Nott, p. ix, from "Henry Howard's Letter to Queen Elizabeth. Lambeth MSS. DCCXI.20."

attendance at Court. But the children appear to have remained constantly at home.<sup>8</sup>

As Nott, in his copyings from this *Household Book*,<sup>9</sup> cites no record of the birth of Henry Howard and no circumstances which would cause one to infer that a birth had taken place, it seems safe to assume that no such record is there. This justifies the assumption that Henry Howard, being born in 1517, was born before his parents returned to Tendring Hall for the summer; that is to say, he was born in the winter or early spring of 1517, and probably at Hunsdon.

But the poet's grandfather, with whom the Earl of Surrey's family spent the winter months, had many other residences besides Hunsdon. It is possible, therefore, that the Countess of Surrey might at this time have been visiting her father-in-law at one of these other residences. The Duke of Norfolk often stayed at Framlingham and at Kenninghall. Either of these places may possibly have been the birthplace of Henry Howard, although Nott's suggestion, "As [the poet] was generally styled Henry Howard, of Kenninghall, his grandfather's principal place of residence in Norfolk, it may be inferred that he was born there,"<sup>10</sup> has no weight as evidence. The source of such an appellation in sixteenth-century England was commonly derived from the principal residence rather than from the place of birth.

ii. Henry Howard passed his childhood in rural England. For the greater part of his first years he dwelt at Tendring Hall, in Stoke by Neyland, Suffolk. In the *Household Book* mentioned above are many records of food served there to "my Lord Howard" in the nursery.

As this was several centuries before the modern English schedule of eating had evolved, and afternoon tea had not yet

<sup>8</sup> Nott, p. xi (note). In 1891 this household book was at Thirlestaine House, Cheltenham (Sir Thomas Phillipps MS. No. 3841); Bapst, p. 156. As this library is being dispersed, I have been unable to ascertain its present location. In 1907 Brenan & Statham, p. 145, wrote that it "was in the possession of the late Sir Thomas Phillipps."

<sup>9</sup> Nott, app. II. His original notes from it are at Norfolk House and Arundel Castle. Nor does Bapst mention such a record.

<sup>10</sup> Nott, p. ix; accepted by Padelford, p. 6.

become an English institution, breakfast in this household was at daybreak; the dinner hour was 10 A.M.; and the supper hour was 5 P.M. A breakfast for "my Lord Howard" when he was less than six years old was "a breast of mutton and a chicken." At dinner he received food similar to that served at his father's table, where eight persons ate portions of the following:

First Course: Two capons boiled, and a breast of mutton, and a piece of beef, 7 Chevets, a swan, a pig, a breast of veal, 2 capons roast, and a custard. Second Course: 4 mess morts, 6 chickens, 8 pigeons, 3 conies, 2 shovelers, 5 sepys, one dozen of quail, 2 pasties of venison, a tart, nuts and pears.

The art of dietetics was unknown. The young Henry Howard ate meat again in the evening. A typical supper served at Tendring Hall to twenty persons was,

First Course: A neck of mutton boiled, 2 slices of beef, calves feet, a shoulder and breast of mutton, and a capon. Second Course: 4 chickens, 3 rabbits, 6 quails, a pasty of venison.

From this *Household Book*, which records the movements of the Earl of Surrey's family until 1524, we learn that when the young Henry Howard was not at Tendring Hall he was visiting his grandfather, the Duke of Norfolk. His visits, with his mother, to the various country seats of the Duke were frequent.

iii. During the early years of the life of his eldest son the military duties of Thomas, Earl of Surrey, necessitated frequent and prolonged absences from his family. The longest of these was during his service as the King's Deputy in Ireland for the twenty months following April, 1520. This sojourn in Dublin possibly resulted from Wolsey's desire to remove from the court Surrey's opposition to his influence. As Lord Herbert of Cherbury<sup>11</sup> tells us:

Against Surrey the Cardinall proceeded otherwise [than he did against Buckingham, whom he had tried and beheaded for treason] for, though he hated him for drawing his dagger at him on some occasion; yet as the Earle was more wary then to give new offence, he thought fit to send him away upon some honourable imploy-

<sup>11</sup> *Henry VIII*, p. 108-109; see also Holinshed, IV, 1508.



ment. . . . [And evidently at Wolsey's behest] the Earle of Surrey . . . going to Ireland . . . reduced the Earle of Desmond and others to obedience.

The Earl of Surrey being away from home so much of the time, his wife would have had almost sole charge of their children.<sup>12</sup> Occasionally court duties caused the Countess to be absent from the children, as she left them at home when going to court,<sup>13</sup> but during their extreme youth her attendances there were infrequent.

The Countess of Surrey's treatment of her children at this time does not appear; nevertheless, some inference may perhaps be drawn from the later attitude of her children towards her: her eldest son, Henry, and her daughter, Mary, both supported the father against the mother in the bitter quarrel which arose between the two parents.<sup>14</sup> That his father controlled the family purse strings could not have been the only cause of the actions of a son having Surrey's character.

iv. On 21 May, 1524, the Duke of Norfolk, Henry Howard's grandfather, died.<sup>15</sup> The "Victor of Flodden" was accorded a state funeral at Framlingham. Thither came the nobles to pay their respects to the dead hero. As he had been extremely popular among the common people, as well as highly esteemed at the court, thither came also citizens and 'prentices from London and mourners from Norfolk, Suffolk, and the adjoining counties in such numbers that many had to sleep

in the open air upon the slopes surrounding the castle. A full account of the funeral ceremonies, drawn up by the College of Heralds, has been preserved, and though too long to be quoted here, affords a good example of the splendour with which a great nobleman was laid to rest in those days.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The Earl of Surrey did not take his family with him to Dublin when he was Deputy of Ireland. As Bapst, p. 155, points out, the single piece of evidence offered to prove that he did so is not acceptable. Also, in the Archives of Norfolk House, I found an abstract of a letter from the Earl of Surrey to Henry VIII concerning affairs in Ireland in which the Earl expresses his desire that his wife and children be sent "into Wales or Lancashire, to remain near the seaside until this death cease."

<sup>13</sup> Nott, p. xi, from the *Household Book*.

<sup>14</sup> *L. & P.*, XIV, i, 160.

<sup>15</sup> *Memorials*, p. 9.

<sup>16</sup> *Brenan & Statham*, p. 110.

Thomas, Earl of Surrey, inherited the title of Duke of Norfolk and—with the exception of the jointure reserved for the Dowager Duchess—the estates of his father. The new Duke immediately gave Tendring Hall to his younger brother, Sir Edmund Howard, and chose Kenninghall as his principal residence. The Duke's retinue increased also, and into his household from time to time came many gifted and learned men, among them John Skelton, Poet Laureate, and John Leland, antiquary.

Henry Howard, from this time styled Earl of Surrey, passed the next five years in his father's household at Kenninghall and Framlingham. A *Household Book*<sup>17</sup> of the latter contains occasional notations of food supplied to him in the nursery. The growing boy's diet continued to be composed largely of flesh. For example: on Friday, 4 January, 1527, at breakfast to my Lord of Surrey was served in the nursery "a pece of saltfysche [and] a dim. dysche [of] Butter," and for supper the same day "a dim. dysche [of] butter., iij playce, and v flounders." Fish was not meat on Fridays. The ancient Christian practice of fasting on Friday had given way to the custom of eating fish on fast days, and at this time the custom was rigidly enforced as a help to the fishing industry.

v. Soon after acceding to the dukedom, Surrey's father took into his household as his secretary one John Clerke, who remained there until 1546. This man was an excellent scholar of Magdalen College, Oxford, who proceeded to his M.A. in 1516, and then travelled widely on the Continent, studying particularly in Italy.<sup>18</sup> Clerke seems to have been the chief intellectual influence upon the young Henry Howard. His wide interests in the classics and in the New Learning of Italy were certainly passed on to Lord Surrey, whose subsequent knowledge of the writings of Petrarch, Serafino, and Sannazaro was at that time rare in England.

<sup>17</sup> E. M. Richardson, *The Lion and the Rose* (London, [1922]), p. 69 ff., prints extracts from this household book, which is a ms. in a bound book numbered 300 of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

<sup>18</sup> In reference to Clerke see Wood, *Athena Oxonienses* (ed. 1813), I, 203; Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (ed. 1877), VIII, 634; Richard Pace, *De Fructu Qui Ex Doctrina* (ed. 1517), p. 24; Charles Dodd, *Church Hist. of Eng.* (ed. 1737), I, 379.

Surrey was probably grounded in Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish before his twelfth year.<sup>19</sup> Although Greek was taught at Oxford by Grocyn as early as 1491, it was long before the study of Greek became an English habit, and Surrey was not familiar with that language. Clerke in the dedication to the Duke of Norfolk of his *Treatise of Nobility* commends the translations from Latin, Italian, and Spanish made by Surrey in his youth.<sup>20</sup> Whether or not Clerke taught him French, that language Surrey certainly knew well through his residence at the French Court.

In addition to stimulating Surrey's interest in literary and linguistic learning, Clerke's influence upon him probably extended to religious matters. Clerke was a zealous Roman Catholic as well as a scholar. As such he would have taken his part in bringing up his pupil to be in sympathy with the rigid Roman Catholicism favored by the Duke. Such early training is indicated by the fact that Surrey retained throughout his life the religious views of his father. None of his actions or writings indicate that his religious attitude or sympathy changed in the slightest during Henry VIII's rupture with the Pope and the subsequent dismemberment of the Roman Catholic Church in England.<sup>21</sup>

At the same time that his scholastic education was being carried forward, Surrey was trained also in the arts of war. Although definite evidence is lacking, it has been suggested<sup>22</sup> that Lord William Howard, young half brother of the Duke of Norfolk and only seven years Surrey's senior, was Surrey's outdoor associate and physical instructor at Kenninghall and Framlingham. Whatsoever the name of his instructor, the skill which Surrey displayed in the tournament and his fighting ability as a soldier demonstrated that his early training in the use of arms was excellent.

It was the custom of the time for the various branches of the

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Padelford, p. 7.

<sup>20</sup> John Clerke published in 1543 a *Treatise of Nobility*, dedicated to the Duke of Norfolk; and in 1545, *De Mortuorum Resurrectione*, dedicated to the Earl of Surrey. Wood also lists other publications.

<sup>21</sup> The attempts of Nott (pp. 365-366, & *ad loc.*) to demonstrate that Surrey was "attached to the Reform Religion" can not be taken seriously, as I demonstrate below.

<sup>22</sup> Brecken & Statham n. 164

family to visit frequently and for long periods at the residence of the head of the family. Surrey probably had as companions of about his own age and fellow students of martial arts his uncle, Lord Thomas Howard, half brother of the Duke, and his cousins Henry, George, and Charles Howard, sons of Lord Edmund Howard and brothers of Queen Catherine Howard. Richard Southwell, who lived nearby at Woodrising, and other young sons of the neighboring nobles probably also gathered at Kenninghall to practice the rudiments of arms and to enjoy what sports youthful ingenuity could devise.

To become an expert horseman was the first task and the first ambition of every one of these youths; for who could be knight who was no horseman? The tilting yard was both their playground and their school. There each strove to outdo his fellows in feats of horsemanship. There each learned to hold a lance at rest. There great mock battles were fought with blunted weapons. As often as the permission of their elders could be gained, to the hunting field would the young students go to follow the fleet staghounds, ever hopeful of being in at the death. Occasionally—it seems probable—when Lord Surrey's elders were elsewhere, the hounds would be loosed in order that the youths might go ahunting by themselves.<sup>23</sup>

vi. The year 1529 brought to a close Surrey's quiet boyhood life in the country. At twelve years<sup>24</sup> of age he became, although through no volition of his own, a figure in the strife for power in England when both domestic politics and foreign relations had reached a very precarious state. In consequence, we find that the exigencies of the high position to which his high birth had raised him more often than not obscure the character of the young man.

Most men in England had come to hate Wolsey, who at this time was Henry VIII's ecclesiastical Lord Chancellor and Vicegerent. They distrusted the foreign policies which he was using

<sup>23</sup> At a later date the Duke of Norfolk wrote to Cromwell from York, "His [Surrey's] being there [at Kenninghall] doth not only cause many to resort to him to my charge, but also doth cause my deer not to be spared"; *L. & P.*, XII, ii, 248.

<sup>24</sup> Here and hereafter my references to Surrey's age assume that he was born in 1517; see above, pp. 21-24.

his influence and authority to force upon the King and the nation. Probably only Henry's desire for the Cardinal's help in obtaining his divorce from Catherine of Aragon enabled Wolsey to retain possession of the Great Seal, which signified his authority as Lord Chancellor.

Catherine had failed in the first duty of a queen: she had reached an age when it was no longer likely that she would bear children without having presented Henry VIII with a male heir. Only one of the seven children which she had conceived had lived, and this child was a frail girl. In consequence, Catherine's opposition to the divorce was doomed to fail. The claim for personal justice could not prevail against political expediency. Henry VIII's desire to divorce his infecund queen was not merely the result of his extravagant passion for Anne Boleyn. The divorce from Catherine was a necessity to him in order that he might marry again to secure a legal male heir. He and his people wanted an heir apparent to the throne to forestall any possible dispute over the succession, which might lead to a recurrence of civil war.

The Sack of Rome in 1527 had established the ascendancy of Charles of Spain over the Pope and had lessened respect for papal authority. As Charles V was Catherine's relative, the struggle to gain Pope Clement VII's sanction of the validity of Henry VIII's claim for a divorce was almost hopeless from the beginning. Nevertheless, the insecurity of his authority in England forced Clement to make a show of weighing the matter. He sent a nuncio to England to open a Legatine Court in May, 1529. Professedly this court was to decide the merits of Henry VIII's arguments for his divorce, but the opposition of Charles obliged the Pope to order his nuncio to procrastinate as long as possible and in no case to reach a verdict.<sup>25</sup>

To gain French advocacy of the divorce, England had to retain her close alliance with France. With this in view Wolsey's ambassadors had let themselves be inveigled by the French into a joint declaration of war against Spain in January, 1528. Although no hostilities were undertaken and Henry and Charles

<sup>25</sup> *L. & P.*, IV, 4736, 4737, 4857; cf. A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, ch. VIII, esp. p. 216.

were soon discussing peace, this state of war was extremely unpopular in England. The people objected because it interrupted England's trade with the Spanish Netherlands. Henry VIII disliked the situation because it strengthened Charles V's opposition to the divorce. Moreover, the Peace of Cambrai, which ended these hostile relations in 1529, revealed the decline of England's political position since 1521. Henry VIII could scarcely curb the ire which Wolsey's actions had stirred up. The Cardinal's fall was imminent, and the increasing influence of Anne Boleyn, who was of the anti-ecclesiastical party, would unquestionably place his lost authority in the hands of those rising in her train.

vii. How would Henry VIII try to disentangle this knot of political complications? Upon whom would fall his anger for the state of his affairs? These were the worries of every member of the English Court when Henry, Earl of Surrey, became a pawn in the political intrigues. His name appears for the first time in a public record in a document of 23 July, 1529.<sup>26</sup> On that date he visited Butley Priory, Suffolk, with his father, who went there to arrange the sale of Staverton Park to the Butley Prior. Although the Earl of Surrey was only twelve years of age at this time, the register of the priory describes him as having his own retinue of twenty-four ("*per estimationem*") attendants. The Duke of Norfolk did not waste money or make idle display. He had uses for an eldest son, and Surrey's having his own attendants signified that his active duties as the eldest son of the leader of the old nobility had begun.

Notwithstanding that Surrey himself had not yet appeared at court, by autumn his name had reached there. In a letter dated 9 December, 1529, Eustache Chapuis, the Imperial Ambassador, wrote to Charles V:

[The Duke of Norfolk] took me by the hand to conduct me to the

<sup>26</sup> Nott, p. xiv, where are printed two entries from "*Registrum Butley Suff. penes Le Neve*." I have been unable to determine the present location of this register. Bapst evidently saw it about 1891, for he prints (p. 163) one of these two entries with slight variations. *The Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*, IV, 409, also notes Surrey's visit to Butley Priory at this date, as from the register, but does not mention its location.

supper table, and during the repast shewed me a letter from his son in very good Latin, which he desired me to read and give my opinion upon, adding that he was much pleased with the youth's proficiency and advancement in letters, as it was a very good commencement for a project which he had and would declare to me later in the evening. And so he did, for about midnight, on my leaving the house where the French Ambassador and Papal Nuncio still remained, he also left, and though there was a much shorter road to his hotel, insisted on passing by my lodgings and accompanying me thither. In the course of the conversation he said to me: "I told you that I was on many accounts delighted to see my son making so much progress in his studies, and following the path of virtue, and since it is but proper that friends should communicate to each other their most secret affairs and thoughts, I do not hesitate to tell you my ideas on this subject. The King has entrusted to me the education of his bastard son, the Duke of Richmond, of whom my own son may become in time preceptor and tutor (*incitateur*), that he may attain both knowledge and virtue, so that a friendship thus cemented promises fair to be very strong and firm; and will be further consolidated by alliance; for the King wishes the Duke to marry one of my daughters."<sup>27</sup>

This illegitimate son of Henry VIII was Henry Fitzroy.<sup>28</sup> He was born at Blackmore in Essex in 1519, his mother being Elizabeth Blount.<sup>29</sup> His birth had been kept very secret for six years, but the continued failure of Catherine of Aragon to bring forth a male heir caused Henry VIII to acknowledge his natural son and to bestow greater and greater marks of favor upon him. On 18 June, 1525, Henry Fitzroy was created Earl of Nottingham and Duke of Richmond and Somerset.<sup>30</sup> These titles make clear that Henry VIII was considering the possibilities of making this natural son his legal heir.<sup>31</sup> Earl of Richmond had been Henry VII's title before the Battle of Bos-

<sup>27</sup> *Sp. Cal.*, 1529-30, no. 228.

<sup>28</sup> For the life of Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond, see *Camden Miscellany*, III (London, 1855), "Biographical Memoir of Henry Fitzroy . . ." and "Inventory of [His] Goods," edited by J. G. Nichols; also Henry Ellis, *Original Letters*, 1st series (London, 1825), I, 267; 3rd series (London, 1846), I, 333; II, 117.

<sup>29</sup> Daughter of Sir John Blount; about 1523 she married Sir Gilbert Tailboys; secondly she married Edward, Lord Clinton, who became the first Earl of Lincoln.

<sup>30</sup> Holinshed, IV, 1536; Hall, p. 703.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 183.

worth Field enabled him to seize the crown; Duke of Somerset had been the title of Henry VII's grandfather and the title of Henry VIII himself while his elder brother Arthur lived; moreover, during the reign of the Tudors the title of duke was becoming a prerogative confined almost solely to the royal family.

The new Duke of Richmond was placed in charge of his godfathers, the Duke of Norfolk and Cardinal Wolsey, given a suitable retinue, and settled at Sheriff Hutton, in Yorkshire. There he pursued his education until 1530.

viii. By the end of 1529 Henry VIII had turned definitely away from Catherine of Aragon and was considering bringing his only son to reside at Windsor Castle. Without having rendered a decision in the matter of Henry VIII's divorce, the Legatine Court had been adjourned on 23 July by the papal nuncio, Campeggio. He could not prolong the suit further without being forced to pronounce a sentence.

The failure to obtain papal sanction of the divorce precipitated the fall of Wolsey. On 18 October the Great Seal was taken from him by the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk.<sup>32</sup> Cardinal Wolsey's loss of the lord chancellorship, and the subsequent placing of the Great Seal in the hands of Sir Thomas More, greatly increased the influence of the Duke of Norfolk as the year 1529 drew to a close. To the Duke this was an opportunity to strengthen his position. Having become the brother-in-law of Henry VII and the uncle of Henry VIII by his own first marriage, Norfolk strove to add yet another legal relationship between the Tudors and the Howards by marrying his daughter to the Duke of Richmond. His plans for binding together the two families also made him eager to establish a bond of friendship between his son and this only son of the King.

The latter of these two desires of the Duke of Norfolk was fulfilled first: by 2 April, 1530, the Duke of Richmond had been brought from Sheriff Hutton to The More, a royal manor in Essex.<sup>33</sup> Possibly it had been arranged for Surrey to join him

<sup>32</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 262.

<sup>33</sup> Bapst, p. 165, whose source is Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds français, no. 3019, fol. 126.



there. By April 23 the Duke of Richmond was with his father at Windsor Castle,<sup>34</sup> and the two youths probably took up their residence at Windsor from that date.<sup>35</sup> The growth of their friendship and their happiness while residing there seems to be affirmed by Surrey's own poem which he wrote while imprisoned there after the death of his companion:

So cruell prison, how coulede betide, alas,  
As proude Windsor? where I in lust and ioye,  
With a kinges sonne, my childishe yeres did passe,  
In greater feast than Priams sonnes of Troye.<sup>36</sup>

At Windsor Castle the youths resided until the autumn of 1532, when they accompanied Henry VIII to France and remained to pass a year at the French Court.<sup>37</sup>

ix. In 1529 Surrey began to be used also as a pawn in the matrimonial intrigues of the court of Henry VIII. The high position in the marriage market to which his birth entitled him made extremely probable that an advantageous matrimonial alliance could be arranged. Henry VIII's liaison with Anne Boleyn had given her much influence in affairs at court, and at this time she was using her influence to the advantage of the Howards. Not only was it being suggested that Surrey be the youthful companion and "the preceptor and tutor" of the King's only son; he was also considered as an eligible husband for the Princess Mary, then the only legitimate child of Henry VIII. In regard to this possibility, Chapuis, the Spanish Ambassador in England, wrote to the Emperor on 8 October, 1529, "*L'on m'a envoy  tout maintenant de bon lieu dire que le Roy estoit tant aveugl  et abus  de cette dame (Anne Boleyn) que,*

<sup>34</sup> *Garter*, II, 384-385.

<sup>35</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 175, is the first writer of authority to mention the life together at Windsor of Richmond and Surrey, and much tradition has been thrown around it by later writers on Surrey. Some nineteenth century writers denied Surrey's residence at Windsor entirely and even refused to admit that Surrey lived at the French Court, for which abundant proof exists. <sup>36</sup> Arber, p. 13.

<sup>37</sup> No evidence has been found to support the statement in *Athena Oxonienses* (ed. 1721) I, 68, that Surrey was "for a time a Student in Cardinal College [now Christ Church College, Oxford]." Surrey's name is nowhere to be found in the Christ Church records; Edmund Lodge, *Portraits . . .* (London, 1823-34), I, 15. Cf. Nott, pp. xx-xxi.

*à sa persuasion, il estoit réduit de vouloir traicter le mariage de la Princesse avec le filz du duc de Norforch son parent (d'Anne)."*<sup>38</sup>

As Catherine of Aragon was Spanish, it obviously follows that Charles V and his ambassador, Chapuis, were bitterly opposed to Henry VIII's divorce from her and his attentions to Anne Boleyn.

But Anne soon ceased to draw attention to the eligibility of the Earl of Surrey as a husband. The uncertainty of the divorce imperiled her position. Her hope of continued favor rested largely upon the attitude of France toward her. In an effort to gain the French King's assistance in securing the Pope's sanction of the divorce, she began to encourage the marriage of the Princess Mary to Francis I.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps she had also come to realize that by marrying Norfolk's son to the daughter of Catherine of Aragon she might be presenting the Queen with an ally, instead of binding the Duke of Norfolk to her own cause. Another possible reason for Anne's change of attitude was the suggestion, reported by Miguel Mai, Imperial Ambassador at Rome, that the King might mitigate the difficulties of his position by marrying Anne herself to Surrey, "which may be believed as being good for all parties; first, for her, as she cannot marry the King, that she should marry the greatest lord in the realm; and secondly, to the King, as he cannot marry her."<sup>40</sup>

Before the end of 1530 the Duke began to deny that he desired the Princess for his son.<sup>41</sup> A letter written by Chapuis on 31 October contains the statement, "*Ledit Duc me dit aussy que pour esviter la suspicion du monde qui pense qu'il tasche à la Princesse pour son filz, qu'il le marriera (fiancera) avant ung moys à femme que sans ladite occasion et considération ne luy eust voulu pour xxx<sup>m</sup> escus davantage qu'elle n'a.*"<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Vienne, Archives de la Burg, Rep. P. fasc. c. 225, no. 22; as printed by Bapst, p. 175. *Ibid.*, p. 177, is printed another letter from Chapuis to the Emperor, 13 December, 1529, to the same effect. A few years before the Duke of Norfolk had considered marrying Surrey to Lady Elizabeth Marney, whose guardian he was. This heiress was later married to Surrey's younger brother, Thomas; see Bapst, p. 173.

<sup>39</sup> Hall, p. 732.

<sup>40</sup> *L. & P.*, IV, 6452; written 14 June, 1530.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 941; Bapst, p. 177.

<sup>42</sup> Vienne, Archives de la Burg, Rep. P. fasc. c. 226, no. 44; as printed by Bapst, p. 178.

More than a year passed, however, before the Duke of Norfolk concluded this alliance. Not until February, 1532, did he contract his eldest son to the Lady Frances de Vere, daughter of John, Earl of Oxford.<sup>43</sup> The marriage was to take place on, or before, the feast of Pentecost next ensuing. A month before, 15 January, an assurance of lands had been made to Henry, Earl of Surrey, for his marriage.<sup>44</sup> The original indenture of this marriage was preserved until the nineteenth century, and Nott states that it contained the following provisions:

The Duke of Norfolk [agreed to settle] lands on Surrey [which would yield] a clear yearly rent of £300. The Earl of Oxford [was to give] Lady Frances a fortune of 4,000 marks; 200 [marks] to be paid on the day of the marriage and the remainder at half-yearly payments of 100 marks; unless either of the Countesses of Oxford then living should die, when the instalments were to be raised to 200 marks each. In the event of Surrey's death, before or after the marriage, the Lady Frances was to retain, as her jointure for her life, three estates in Norfolk, and the Duke of Norfolk was to keep 1000 marks of her fortune; the remainder to be refunded. There were seventeen trustees to the settlement. The Duke was to be at the charge of Surrey's clothes; Lord Oxford of those for the Lady Frances.<sup>45</sup>

The marriage took place as contracted. Chapuis wrote to Charles V from London, 16 April, 1532:

J'ay cy devant escript à Vostre Majesté comme le duc de Norphoc m'avoit plusieurs foys dit qu'il vouloit bientost marier son filz pour oster la sospicion du monde qu'il ne voulsist tascher à la Princesse. Il a ces jours comply la promesse, et fault bien qu'il ayt ce fait pour ladicte ou autre urgente cause; car le filz ne sera encoures habile à mariage de troys ans et la fille n'est de grands biens ne grands alliance. Lon m'a donné à entendre que dame Anne a esté celle qui a sollicité et contraint le dict Duc à ce fère, doubtant qu'il ne taschast à ladicte Princesse et par ce moyen et du crédit qu'il a desjà qu'il ne la déchaussast.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup> There had been in the preceding generations several marriages between the Howards and the family of the Earl of Oxford.

<sup>44</sup> *L. & P.*, V, 720 (9).

<sup>45</sup> Nott, p. xxiii.

<sup>46</sup> Vienne, Archives de la Burg. Rep. P. fasc. c. 227, no. 16; as printed by Bapst, p. 179.

Chapuis was mistaken in writing that Surrey's wife was without wealth, as the above indenture proves; although she was not of the royal family, her connections were excellent.

Necessity forced upon Surrey a wife when he was too young to have the slightest word in the matter. But fate was kind. This was a happy marriage. No domestic troubles entered into his life, so complicated with other difficulties. Even at the height of his military career he longed for the companionship of his wife and wrote on several occasions to the Privy Council for permission—which was refused—to bring his wife to his side at Boulogne.<sup>47</sup>

Surrey's marriage, however, did not interrupt his life with the Duke of Richmond. As he and his wife were deemed too young to live together, the two youths remained in residence at Windsor Castle until the autumn of 1532.

<sup>47</sup> *L. & P.*, XX, ii, 658.

### CHAPTER III

## COMPANION OF THE KING'S SON

Surrey had the opportunity to reside at the French Court for almost a year, beginning in the autumn of 1532, because of the political situation created by Henry VIII's attempt to divorce Catherine of Aragon. During the summer Charles of Spain had forced Clement VII to agree to give him an interview in December. As Charles was the nephew of Catherine, and for political reasons was doing all he could to thwart her being cast off by Henry VIII, the announcement of this arrangement at the Roman Court caused much speculation.<sup>1</sup> The common belief was that Charles would be able at the interview to bring the Pope to pronounce against the divorce. The spirit of nationalism had sprung up by this time and with it the European political policy of treaties and alliances to maintain the Balance of Power. The Pope's pronouncement of such a decision against the conscientious scruples of the English King, given at the instigation of the Spanish Emperor, would be definite expression of political accord between the Pope and the Emperor. This would constitute a threat against the powers of both the English and the French monarchs.

Word of this prospective hostile alliance soon reached England and France. Henry and Francis immediately set about to offset its possible influence by exhibiting the closeness of their friendship before the Pope and Emperor should meet. No aureate pomp and magnificent ceremony, such as had dazzled the world at the meeting of these two monarchs on the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520, was to grace this display of friendship. But their professed unanimity was never more nearly real.

At this interview Henry VIII proposed to present Anne Boleyn to Francis I and to seek the French King's aid in forcing the Pope to grant his divorce from Catherine of Aragon.

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed discussion of the divorce see A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 173 ff., which is the source of the general interpretation in this chapter of matters pertaining to the divorce.

To secure Anne's social position, she was created Marquis of Pembroke on 1 September. (She was styled "marquis" in the patent, indicating the possession of the peerage in her own right.)<sup>2</sup> On 11 October, 1532, the new Marchioness of Pembroke accompanied Henry VIII when "at three of the clocke [in the morning], he tooke shippyng in Douer rode, and before .x. of the clocke thesame daie . . . landed at Caleis,"<sup>3</sup> which was then a fortified city in the possession of the English crown. In their retinue were "the duke of Richemond his bastard sonne, the duke of Norfolke . . . , [and] the erle of Surrey."<sup>4</sup>

The descriptions of this visit as recorded by various writers<sup>5</sup> differ in minute detail, but the majority agree that the Duke of Richmond and his companion, the Earl of Surrey, were present at most of the ceremonies. But the two youths were persons, not personalities, at this display of the friendship between the English and French kings.

Henry and Francis met first (21 October) at Morguison, midway between Calais and Boulogne. Francis, the host, immediately led the English King and his retinue to Boulogne. The morning of 25 October the French King called a chapter of his Order of Saint-Michel, to which he had previously elected Henry VIII. At the ceremony the honor of membership in that order was conferred upon Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, and Charles, Duke of Suffolk.<sup>6</sup> The two kings and their escorts then journeyed to Calais, where Henry was to be the host. On their way thither,

without Calice twoo mile, met with them the Duke of Richemond . . . , a goodly young Prince, and full of fauoure and beautie, with a greate compaignie of noble men. . . . The Duke with his compaignie embrased the Frenche kyng, and so did other noble men. Then the lordes of England set forward, as the Dukes of Richemond, Norffolke and Suffolke . . . the Erles of Arüdell, Oxford, Surrey, Darby<sup>7</sup>, . . .

<sup>2</sup> *L. & P.*, V, 1274.

<sup>3</sup> Hall, p. 790.

<sup>4</sup> *Chronicle of Calais*, J. G. Nichols, editor; Camden Society Publication No. 35 (London, 1846), p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Among these are: *Chronicle of Calais*; Holinshed, IV, 1558; Lord Herbert, p. 339; Hall, p. 790; *L. & P.*, V, app. 33.

<sup>6</sup> Hall, p. 792.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

and others, leading the way into Calais. There the ceremonious display of the unanimity of Henry and Francis continued until 30 October. Surrey's name does not appear with that of the Duke of Richmond at the later ceremonies. As a short time later he was suffering from "an ague which he had before he left Calais,"<sup>8</sup> probably illness prevented him from being present.

The pageant ended and the courts separated on 1 November. Before they parted the friendly kings had arranged a treaty in which Francis agreed to see the Pope in order to assist Henry VIII to obtain the papal sanction of his divorce. Henry VIII and his train left Calais on 13 November to return to England, leaving behind "the King's bastard son and the son of the duke of Norfolk, with 60 horse, who will remain in France for the greater security of the treaty."<sup>9</sup> Such a retinue for two lads under sixteen years of age indicates the importance attached to their position.

The young companions left Calais on 11 November<sup>10</sup> to travel slowly through France and join the French Court about the first of December, the Court being then at Chantilly. Many records pertaining to their visit have been preserved. Montmorency, Grand Master of the King's House, wrote to the Bishop of Auxerre, 8 December, 1532, "The king of England has sent hither his bastard son and the son of the duke of Norfolk, who are being brought up with the King's [Francis I's] children."<sup>11</sup> Richard Tate wrote to Cromwell on 11 December to report the reception of the English youths in France:

My lords of Richmond and Surrey have been well welcomed in their journey toward the French court with presents of wine and other gentle offers. My lord of Richmond has been in good health, and finds the country "very natural unto him." Surrey has suffered from an ague which he had before he left Calais, but it is hoped the worst is past. On arriving at the Court, which was at Chantely, the Great Master's<sup>12</sup> house, the King embraced my lord and made him great cheer, "saying that he thought himself now to have four

<sup>8</sup> *L. & P.*, V, 1627.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 1538.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 1529.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 1616. The sons of the French King at this time were: Francis, Dauphin of France, born Feb. 28, 1518; Henry, Duke of Orleans, born Mar. 31, 1519; and Charles, Duke of Angoulême, born Jan. 22, 1522.

<sup>12</sup> Anne de Montmorency.

sons and exty[med] him no less." After the Daulphin and his brethern and all the noblemen had embraced him, he was taken into the King's privy chamber, where the King told him he should always be as one of his chamber. In Paris he has lodging in the Daulphin's own lodging, and sups with him and his brethern. Has found the Great Master and other governors to the Daulphin tractable and willing.<sup>13</sup>

Surrey was the Duke of Richmond's companion, and as such he would receive marks of favor similar to those shown to the young Duke.

The French King and his train moved almost continually while these two young Englishmen were in attendance; consequently, their sojourn at the French Court caused them to visit a large part of France.<sup>14</sup> Only the winter months were passed in Paris. There the three French princes and the two young Englishmen lodged together, forgot their official positions as much as they were permitted to do so, and grew very friendly. With the coming of spring, however, Francis began to move about, and the youths had less freedom. On 23 April, 1533, the Court being then in Fontainebleau, the French King celebrated the festival of the Order of the Garter, of which he was a member. The Duke of Richmond took a prominent part in the ceremony.<sup>15</sup> The next day Richmond and Surrey attended Francis when he set out for Lyons. He was starting south because he expected to meet Pope Clement VII in La Provence in July.

When the Court arrived in Lyons about the middle of May, it was learned that the Pope would not come to France until autumn. Francis was forced to change his plans. He decided to split the French Court in two. Queen Eleanor was to return into Le Midi while Francis continued toward the center of his kingdom to visit his provinces of Auvergne and Languedoc. The five young men had to separate. The French princes were ordered to accompany the Queen, their step-mother. Surrey

<sup>13</sup> *L. & P.*, V, 1627.

<sup>14</sup> Bapst, pp. 181-196, has carefully traced the movements of Francis I and his court at this time; this is my chief source for the movements of Surrey at this period.

<sup>15</sup> *Ven. Cal.*, 1527-1533, no. 876.



and Richmond followed the King as he moved leisurely through the southern provinces of France, visiting many of the picturesque places of that old civilization until meeting with Pope Clement at Marseilles in October.

ii. Many have expressed surprise that Surrey in his poetry makes no reference to and draws no allusions from his experiences at the French Court.<sup>16</sup> Although he was then at a very impressionable age, being sixteen years old, none of his poetry reflects direct French influence, and those who have called attention to this fact have been puzzled by it. According to their reasoning, the dominance of Italian artists at the court of Francis I does not furnish a satisfactory explanation, for the influence of the French is marked in the poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Elder—the author who is credited with initiating in English many of the poetic forms which Surrey vitalized into a new English poetic tradition.

The explanation is to be found, I think, in the difference between Surrey's experience in France and that of Wyatt; in Surrey's attitude towards his poetry; in his willingness to adapt from foreign models only that which is poetically congruous with the genius of English; in his sincere (if unconscious) love of "This blessed plot, . . . this England." Although Wyatt travelled extensively in France and came into contact with various literary groups there, Surrey during his visit at this time had opportunity to meet only those of the King's Court, where Italian artists and poets and admiration for things Italian were paramount. Moreover, to Surrey writing poetry was a literary exercise, a "polite" accomplishment, and rarely is he consciously and openly autobiographical. Such incidental references to his personal experience and feelings as he does make are conventional, ironical, occasioned by his writing an eulogy, or reflections of his love of English nature.

<sup>16</sup> The lines:

And now, though on the sunne I drue,  
Whose feruent flame all thinges decaies,

from Surrey's poem beginning, "Syns fortunes wrath" (ll. 13-14; Padelford, p. 70), have been said (Padelford, p. 11) to allude to Surrey's sojourn with the French Court, but the context of the poem seems to be against this view.

Surrey's residence at the French Court did, however, have a pronounced influence upon his conduct—upon his manners and his carriage. There he learned the niceties of manners which were emanating from the Italy of the Renaissance. There he learned the hauteur of carriage which was so admired when he returned to England. There he acquired the courtly graces and the bearing which made him the prototype of the Elizabethan courtiers.

iii. While Surrey was in France, Henry VIII had skillfully eliminated the necessity of obtaining the Pope's sanction to make legal in England his divorce from Catherine of Aragon. Shortly after returning from his interview with Francis I, Henry learned that Anne Boleyn was with child. A male heir to succeed to his throne was Henry's foremost wish. The possibility that Anne's child might be a boy excited him to action. At all costs the birth of this child must be legitimate, for the desire for a male heir to the crown was widespread in this "nation of shopkeepers."

The sixteenth century was the age when England was turning from agriculture to commerce. Events of the reign of Henry VIII can be understood only with the knowledge that commercial interests were rising to dominance. The people of England had been strongly against the divorce, not because of any sympathy for a woman wronged, but because they were afraid that the divorce would arouse the hostility of Charles V. His hostility, they thought, would interrupt the textile trade with Flanders. As Chapuis wrote,

[To compel Henry VIII to forego his divorce, the] forbidding intercourse with Flanders is the best course. [Henry VIII] is very much afraid of that, as knowing he could not prevent a mutiny [if Charles V did so], unless he were willing for some time to subsidise those who live by making cloth, who are considerably more than half the people of England; and this he could not do without double the money he has.<sup>17</sup>

The unpopularity of the divorce in England was lessened,

<sup>17</sup> *L. & P.*, VI, 1528.

however, by the Pope's removal to Rome of the papal court. With great adroitness Henry VIII used the opportunity with which the Pope's lack of decision presented him. Bitterness against the lesser ecclesiastics was strong in England because of widespread abuse of clerical privileges, avariciousness of the church officials, and viciousness in the monasteries. To this Henry successfully sought to add a distrust of papal authority. The possibility that the Pope would cite the King of England to appear in person, or by proxy, before the papal court which had been moved to Rome was used by Henry VIII as propaganda. As his subjects were filled with the rising spirit of nationalism, he knew that they would not tolerate such a proposed papal interference with their King's prerogatives. In the rising feeling of indignation against the Pope the opposition of the English people to the divorce dwindled.

Never did an English King use diplomatic artifice more skillfully. The Archbishopric of Canterbury had fallen vacant by the death of Henry Warham in August, 1532. Upon learning of Anne's pregnancy, Henry set about to facilitate the investment of an Archbishop of Canterbury who would do his bidding without question. He also laid plans to secure the legality in England of the Archbishop's pronouncement of the nullity of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Thomas Cranmer was the man Henry VIII chose to be his Archbishop, and he took upon himself the task of securing from Rome the expedition of the bulls for Cranmer's investiture. The English representatives sent to Rome were to make generally known that only the King's opposition to the Acts of Annates, already passed by Parliament, prevented the Pope and cardinals from being deprived of a large part of their English revenues; moreover, the English representatives were to advertise discreetly that the royal assent to the Act of Annates might be forthcoming if the necessary bulls were delayed. Henry VIII's diplomacy was successful. On 22 February, 1533, the Consistory at Rome granted the bulls for Cranmer's investment as Archbishop of Canterbury without having received the payment of the 10,000 marks which was the usual prerequisite for these bulls.

The English Convocations and Parliament, Henry handled

equally well. He deluded the ecclesiastics by a false show of friendship with the Pope's nuncio. At his instigation the Conventions of Canterbury and of York were forced to approve two propositions: first, that the Pope could not lawfully grant a dispensation for a man to marry a woman who had been his deceased brother's wife in fact; and second, Catherine of Aragon had been Prince Arthur's wife in fact.

Anticlerical feeling was very pronounced in the Reformation Parliament. Because of this, Henry was able to gain parliamentary sanction of an act forbidding appeals to Rome against the decisions of English ecclesiastical courts. He did this by basing his argument on the specious, conservative plea that general councils had determined that suits should be determined in the place in which they originated. The only opposition to this act arose from the fear of the commercial interests that its passage might arouse a papal interdict which would interrupt trade with the Netherlands. This fear Henry removed by persuading his House of Commons that the wool trade was as important to the Flemings as it was to the English. Having been assured that no commercial loss would result, Parliament passed the Act of Appeals, which secured the jurisdiction of English ecclesiastical courts in English matters.

The investment of his man Cranmer was dispatched. All obstacles to the legal right of the Archbishop to absolve the ties binding Henry VIII to his deceased brother's wife had been removed by the end of April, 1533. No time was lost. Thomas, Archbishop Cranmer, opened his court at Dustable on May 10. Although Catherine refused to recognize the jurisdiction of this court or to appear there, on 23 May the new English archbishop pronounced as the sentence of the court that Henry and Catherine had never been husband and wife. Five days later, without mentioning the date or place of the ceremony, Cranmer was also able to announce that Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn were lawfully married. In an incredibly short time after the King learned that Anne was to present him with a child, Henry VIII had established the legitimacy of the unborn child.

On 1 June, being Whitsunday, Anne Boleyn was crowned Queen in Westminster with gorgeous ceremony and no little

adverse comment by the people. The importance of economic motives in political actions cannot be overstressed. The commoners hated Anne because they feared, despite Henry's assurance to the contrary, that his repudiation of Catherine would destroy their Flemish wool trade. As Anne was conveyed through the City of London to her coronation the people in the streets were so outspoken that at least two persons were sentenced

for opprobrious words against the King [his marriage] to be committed [to prison] till the next Market-day, and then to be stripped from the Middle upward and scourged in different parts of the city, and their ears to be nailed to the Standard in Cheapside till the Mayor cause them to be loosed.<sup>18</sup>

The Duke of Norfolk and Surrey were both in France. Neither was summoned to return for the coronation; consequently, they were not present to see their relative crowned Queen of England or to admire Anne Boleyn's exquisite manners at the coronation banquet in Westminster Hall, where on the right side of the [Queen's] chayre stode the countesse of Oxforde, wydowe, and on the left side stood the countesse of Worcester all the dyner season, which diuers tymes in the dyner tyme did hold a fyne cloth before the quenes face when she list to spet or do otherwyse at her pleasure.<sup>19</sup>

The legality of his marriage to Anne established in England, Henry VIII had nothing to gain—and many revenues to lose—by postponing the break with the Pope. In consequence, the royal assent was given by letters patent to the Act of Annates on 9 July, 1533.

iv. Richmond and Surrey remained with the French Court through the summer. The Duke of Norfolk joined them in July. On the tenth of that month, the Court being then at Riom, "about 1½ mile without the town, met with him [the Duke of Norfolk], t[he Duke of] Richmond and my lord of Surrey,"<sup>20</sup> who having word of his coming, had hastened to welcome their relative.

<sup>18</sup> Repertories 1495-1552 of the Guild Hall, London, rep. 9, fol. 21; and rep. 10, fol. 16.

<sup>19</sup> Hall, p. 804.

<sup>20</sup> *L. & P.*, VI, 831.

As a subterfuge, Henry VIII had proposed that Norfolk should interview the Pope and attempt to persuade His Holiness that Henry's actions were not hostile to the papal interests. But Norfolk's true mission was to alienate Francis from the Holy See. The French King received Norfolk with great courtesy and treated him with marked favor. Henry's approval of the Act of Annates, however, precipitated papal action. On 11 July a sentence of greater excommunication was drawn up against Henry VIII. If the Pope had retained the temporal authority of which the sentence of greater excommunication was a relic, the proclamation of this sentence should have deprived the English sovereign of his throne. In Pope Clement's hands, however, this awful ban of the Church was merely a threat. His own position was so uncertain that he never ventured to assert the traditional authority of papal temporal supremacy throughout Christendom by publishing the sentence. The Pope did, however, have backbone enough to refuse to see Norfolk and to publish, by the prerogative of his spiritual supremacy, a bull excommunicating Henry VIII from the Church while he lived and condemning him to suffer in hell forever after he died. This sentence inconvenienced Henry VIII not at all. His people were not going to repudiate him. Such an act would plunge the country into anarchy. Moreover, the life-to-come which commanded the living Henry's interest at this time was the life-to-come which should provide him with a male heir.

v. The Duke of Norfolk, having failed to obtain an interview with the Pope, and also having been unable to persuade Francis to break his appointment with the Holy See for the autumn, was called back to England in August. Surrey and Richmond were recalled at the same time. The reason given for the recall of the two youths was that Henry VIII wished to conclude the marriage of his son.<sup>21</sup>

Surrey and Richmond, although they took their leave of Francis I at the same time as did the Duke of Norfolk, did not accompany him to England.<sup>22</sup> The Duke arrived in London the

<sup>21</sup> Venice, Palais Ducal, *Sanuto diarii*, vol. LVIII, p. 218; as printed by Bapst, p. 194.

<sup>22</sup> *Chronicle of Calais*, p. 44.

day<sup>23</sup> that Anne Boleyn gave birth to the future Queen Elizabeth—on Sunday, 7 September, 1533. Great preparations for the christening, in which the Howards took a prominent part, were immediately undertaken.<sup>24</sup>

When the Princess Elizabeth was christened, Richmond and Surrey were still on their way toward the English Pale of Calais. Henry VIII had probably arranged matters so. Perhaps he thought it would be inconvenient, and rather inappropriate, to be welcoming home his bastard son while waiting the birth of the child which he hoped would be his male heir. Not until "the xxv of Septembar [did] the duke of Richemond, bastard sone to king Henry the Eighth, and the erle of Surrey [come] to Caleys owt of Fraunce, where they hade bene almoste xij monthes."<sup>25</sup> But the child born to Anne Boleyn proved to be a girl. Without further delay, Richmond and Surrey took shipping.

Shortly after these companions returned to the English court the Duke of Richmond was married to Surrey's sister, the Lady Mary Howard. This marriage had been considered as early as 1529. In spite of the statement later made by the Duchess of Richmond, when she was a widow though yet a maid, that Henry VIII "himself alone made the marriage,"<sup>26</sup> it would seem that this union was instigated by Anne Boleyn, for it was first suggested when she was strongly favoring Howard marriages to the royal blood.<sup>27</sup>

As Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond, and Lady Mary Howard were considered to be related within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity, a dispensation<sup>28</sup> for the marriage had to be secured. This ecclesiastical document records the date of the marriage contract as 26 November, 1533, on which date the purely formal ceremony is said to have been performed at Hampton Court.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Hall, p. 805.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 805 ff., where the ceremony is described in detail.

<sup>25</sup> *Chronicle of Calais*, p. 44.

<sup>26</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Vespas. F. XIII, p. 75; printed by Nott, app. VI.

<sup>27</sup> See Nott, app. p. lxxiii.

<sup>28</sup> This dispensation is printed by Nott, p. xxviii, from "Fere's MSS. Collections."

<sup>29</sup> Brenan & Statham, p. 172.

Upon their return from France, Richmond and Surrey had again taken up their interrupted residence at Windsor Castle—or if Surrey were not in actual residence, he spent most of his time there. Both were then married, but both were too young to live with their wives. Some think Surrey's reference in his poetry to the long delays from the delights of love<sup>30</sup> refers to this period when both youths were waiting to consummate their marriages.

On New Year's Day, 1534, Surrey was honored by receiving the gift of a silver bowl from Henry VIII,<sup>31</sup> although he had made no present to the King, for his youth freed him from the obligation of giving a valuable New Year's gift to the crown—a custom established by Wolsey as a means of adding to the royal income. Apart from this, Surrey's name does not appear in the official records for 1534. Such an omission justifies the assumption that this year of his life was uneventful. No longer a child to be moved about at will, he was nevertheless not yet sufficiently mature to take his own place in affairs. Much of his time he probably devoted to practicing the use of arms and courtly graces, and stimulated by his studies and the influence of the cultivated French Court, to writing his lighter verse in the chivalrous manner which was to dominate Elizabethan poetry. His panegyric beginning "Geue place, ye louers, here before,"<sup>32</sup> which would seem to have served as a model for countless Elizabethans writing eulogistic poems to their mistresses, is generally thought to have been written at this time.

<sup>30</sup> "So cruell prison"; l. 28; Arber, p. 13.

<sup>31</sup> *L. & P.*, VII, 9.

<sup>32</sup> Arber, p. 20.



## CHAPTER IV

### A MIND OF HIS OWN

Although no documentary evidence of the date at which Surrey began to live with his wife has come to light, they were united by 1535 at the latest. In this year both reached the age which in the sixteenth century was deemed proper for the beginning of connubial relationships, and the birth of a son to the Countess of Surrey in the spring of 1536 is conclusive evidence that the marriage which had been celebrated in 1532 was consummated by 1535. As not for some years did the Earl and Countess of Surrey have a dwelling of their own, it is probable that they began their life together at Kenninghall, Norfolk, the principal residence of Surrey's father.

In spite of the stipulation of the marriage contract to the contrary, the Duke of Norfolk was never liberal in supplying his eldest son with money. Surrey was always in want of it. From a letter written by Surrey to the Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds we learn that he was at Kenninghall in June, 1535, and in need of funds. He wrote:

My Lord notw<sup>t</sup> standyng that affore tyme I have barowd off yow to the sume off xxx<sup>li</sup> pownd sterlyng, havynge not yet repayd it; yet by very ned & extreme necessitye I am agayne constrainyd, my nowne good Lord, at this p<sup>re</sup>sent, affectuowsly to desyre yow to shew yoore self so myche my cordiall frend as to lend some over & above xx<sup>li</sup> pownd, in sych hast as I may have it here to morow by viii off the klok, for syche is my p<sup>re</sup>sent nede and thought; my Lord for your syche kyndn<sup>es</sup> to be shewd towards [me] it lyeth not in my powr to offer the lyke recompense; yet my lord ye shall so bynd [me] to be your inward & affectuall frend while I lyve & your money first & last to be honestly repayd to yow agayne w<sup>t</sup> hartye thanks; which iff I wer so ingrat (which god defend) to deny, ye mygth & may it well beleue my lord my father will not so see your harty kyndn<sup>es</sup> vncōtentid; & thus my very good Lord, w<sup>t</sup> harty request of this my desyre I leve yow to god. Displease yow not so thowght my Lord [Norfolk] beynge owt off the cowntree in

this my necessity, I rather attempt to assay yoww his ancyent  
frend than other farther off. from Kenningale this St. Peters.  
yowrs assuredly duryng his liffe,  
H. Surrey.<sup>1</sup>

The abbot evidently granted Surrey's request, for on the back of the letter is the note in another hand, "My lord of Surre xx<sup>li</sup>, and besyds that xxx<sup>li</sup>." For what purpose Surrey desired so large a sum of money (for the modern equivalent the figures must be multiplied at least by ten) in such haste remains a mystery.

No further record of Surrey's activities in 1535 have been discovered. With the beginning of the year 1536, however, court duties began to make demands upon the Earl and Countess of Surrey. The first of these was caused by the death of Catherine of Aragon, who died 8 January at Kimbolton. The Countess of Surrey was called upon to assist in the pre-funeral rites over the deceased "Princess Dowager," as Catherine was officially designated at this time. At the funeral at Peterborough on 1 February the Countess of Surrey was the third official mourner.<sup>2</sup>

ii. With the coming of spring, raiding and plundering again broke out along the border between England and Scotland. There were indications of more serious trouble as well. During the summer of 1535 the new Pope, Paul III, had issued but not published a Bull of Deposition against Henry VIII. Anticipat-

<sup>1</sup> B.M., Addit. MS. No. 24,493, fol. 234. On the back of this is written, "To his very good lord & frend, my lord abott off Birry gyve these. In hast hast hast." This is a lithograph copy made in the nineteenth century by Joseph Hunter, who comments (fol. 231), "This letter is copied immediately from the original among some papers of the Abbey of Bury . . . [written] probably about the year 1530." That date, I think, cannot be correct. Surrey was not then living at Kenninghall, and I cannot believe that this letter was written by a boy under thirteen. Moreover, it is difficult even to conjecture a need of a thirteen-year-old for such a large sum—and even more difficult to believe that an abbot would lend such a sum to him. On the other hand, a young nobleman recently married might be needing money, and the Duke of Norfolk was absent from England in June, 1535. Bapst, p. 211, also assigns the letter to 1535; he writes only "[une] lettre datée de Kenninghall le 29 juin 1535," as if the year were on the letter, which it is not.

<sup>2</sup> L. & P., X, 141 & 284.

ing the publication of this bull, James V of Scotland was advancing tentative claims to the English throne. A revival of the Scottish border war threatened. Francis I and Charles V had again taken up arms, and each was seeking the favor of Henry VIII. In an attempt to settle the perpetually recurring difficulties on England's northern borders, which constantly interfered with English activities in Continental affairs, Henry VIII sent ambassadors to arrange a meeting between James V and himself, the interview to be held at York. At first this plan was well received at the Scottish Court. It was agreed that the Duke of Richmond and the Earl of Surrey should be sent as hostages to Scotland to secure the personal safety of the Scottish King while in England.<sup>3</sup> Before these young hostages could be sent James V changed his mind. He would not come to England; consequently, Richmond and Surrey did not go to Scotland, and Surrey was enabled to remain at home to witness the birth of his heir.

On 12 March, 1536, the Countess of Surrey gave birth to her first child.<sup>4</sup> To the great joy of both the father and the grand-

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 494.

<sup>4</sup> B.M., Addit. MS. No. 24,493, fol. 230<sup>v</sup>. This manuscript, mentioned above, of notes on the lives and works of English poets from Robert of Gloucester to Pope, contains the statement, "It appearing by the inquisition on the death . . . of the [third] Duke of Norfolk in 1554, . . . that . . . the [fourth] Duke of Norfolk was born on 12 March, 1536." This inquisition, of which but one copy has been preserved in the P.R.O. (C142, Chancery Series II, vol. 103, no. 56), is so mutilated that it is impossible to verify Hunter's statement from the original. But Nott, p. xxxi, states, "In August, 1554, the young Duke [the fourth] who succeeded . . . to the title was found, on inquisition, to have been eighteen and upwards."

Attempts which have been made to assign the birth of this Thomas, later fourth Duke of Norfolk, to the year 1538 can be, I think, discredited. Most of them are based on Bod. Lib., Ashmolean MS. No. 394, fol. 93 ff., which contains a horoscope of Surrey's first son, Thomas. This dates his birth 10 March, 1538. Dr. J. K. Fotheringham has kindly checked the horoscope and informed me that it was probably cast after the Duke's death (1572), when the facts of his life were known; that is, a technical analysis of the material reveals that the astrological exercise has been worked in the reverse direction.

A letter in the P.R.O. (St. P. Henry VIII, vol. 130, p. 43) from the Duke of Norfolk to Cromwell, 14 March, 1538 (year correctly assigned by *L. & P.*, XIII, i, 504) contains the statement, "My doughter of Surrey is browght a bedde of a Sone, and notwithstanding that she Loked not to haue ben delyuered vnto after Palme sondaie, yet god be thanked, the childe is as Lustye a boye as nedeth to be . . . My good Lorde I am not a little yoyful to see my twoo Sones, to haue twoo Sones of

father, the child was a boy. Christened Thomas, this male child was destined to fall heir to his grandfather's title of Duke of Norfolk and to follow his father's footsteps to the executioner's block.

iii. Although 1536 opened so auspiciously for Surrey with the birth of a son and heir, this spring gave rise also to a series of events which greatly weakened the position of the Howards. As the first of these, Anne Boleyn fell under the displeasure of the King. Her violent temper and increasing arrogance toward all, including her royal husband, had increased the opposition to her at court. In February she miscarried with a dead boy. In spite of her attitude, her pregnancy had retained for her the protection of Henry VIII's favor. Her continued failure to provide a male heir to the English throne removed this protection, and the premature birth of this lifeless child precipitated an open rupture between Henry and Anne. She then knew that nothing could preserve her position for long but the producing of the male heir apparent which Henry VIII required. Perhaps she suspected Henry VIII of impotency to beget vigorous offspring. The attempts of the Tudors to secure male heirs had met with surprisingly slight results. Prince Arthur, eldest son of Henry VII, had been a weakly child and died prematurely. By Henry VIII, Catherine of Aragon had been pregnant at least seven times and only one child, Princess Mary, had lived.<sup>5</sup> Anne's miscarriage in February was at least her second after the birth of Elizabeth.<sup>6</sup> The conditions may have caused Anne to commit the crimes of which she was accused, tried for, and condemned.

By the middle of April, 1536, certain members of the Privy Council, although their sources of information are unknown,

---

aege mete to awayte on my Lorde Prince." This letter, I believe, refers to Surrey's second son, and not to his first. The Countess of Surrey was delivered unexpectedly of her second son, Henry Howard, later Earl of Northampton, while visiting at Shotisham, 25 Feb. (Nott, p. 427). The year usually given for his birth is 1539, but this letter gives evidence that it was 1538. The Duke writes that he now has two grandsons, and the heir of the Duke's son Thomas was not born until 1542 (G.E.C., *Complete Peerage* (ed. 1926), VI, 584).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, pp. 176-177. <sup>6</sup> *L. & P.*, VII, 232 & 958.

were secretly procuring evidence of Queen Anne's adultery. At the May Day tournament held at Greenwich, Anne appeared with Henry VIII for the last time as Queen. The next day she was accused of incest with her brother, Lord Rochford, and of having committed adultery with Sir Francis Weston, Henry Norris, William Brereton, and Mark Smeaton.

On 15 May, Anne was tried before a panel of twenty-six peers of the realm. As Lord High Steward, the Duke of Norfolk had to preside over this court, while Surrey fulfilled his father's duties as Earl Marshall. So far as the evidence is concerned, her guilt is open to doubt. With the single exception of Smeaton, neither Anne nor any of her accused accomplices confessed—although it is said that Henry VIII before Anne's arrest offered a pardon to Norris if he would admit the crime. Nevertheless, the court found her guilty. Again a Duke of Norfolk was forced to condemn a relative to death. This time it was not such a hateful duty, because the Duke and Anne had come to support hostile interests. Although "the water ranne in his eyes"<sup>7</sup> as he pronounced the sentence, the Duke's tears were, probably, easily dried. On 17 May, Anne's marriage to Henry VIII was declared invalid by Cranmer's ecclesiastical court. Two days later she was executed.<sup>8</sup>

The enmity which had arisen between Queen Anne and the Duke of Norfolk<sup>9</sup> enabled the Lord High Steward and his deputy as Earl Marshall to accept the positions thrust upon them by Henry VIII at the trial of their relative without too much embarrassment. It also prevented any direct consequences of Anne's execution from injuring the Howards. To that family, however, the indirect consequences of Anne's fall were a serious blow. Her death made possible Henry VIII's marriage to Jane Seymour—the act which established the power and placed in ascendancy the most hated rival of the House of Howard.

<sup>7</sup> *Archaeologia*, XXIII, p. 66.

<sup>8</sup> Authority for these facts relating to the trial and execution of Anne Boleyn will be found in Wriothesley, I, 37; Hall, p. 819; *L. & P.*, X, *ad loc.*; Lord Herbert, p. 385 and ms. notes in the Bodleian copy, Fol. Δ624; Bod. Lib., Ashmole MS. No. 861, p. 333. For further information about the last two sources see below, p. 193, n.

<sup>9</sup> Nott, p. xxxiii & app. 38.

iv. On the day Anne Boleyn was executed Cranmer granted a special licence for the marriage of Henry VIII to Jane, daughter of Sir John Seymour of Wolf Hall, in Wiltshire. The ceremony of marriage was performed privately "in the Queen's closet at York Place" on 30 May, 1536.<sup>10</sup>

Henry VIII began to bestow increasing favors upon the members of his third wife's family. Sir Edward Seymour, brother of the new queen, was created Viscount Beauchamp on 5 June; later he became the Earl of Hertford, and finally Duke of Somerset. Being one of the "new men" made him the enemy of the Howards. His steadily increasing influence with Henry VIII was augmented and made permanent by the birth of the prince who was to become Edward VI. As the uncle of the heir apparent to the English throne, Sir Edward Seymour became Surrey's rival. This personal rivalry, combined with the continued hostility of this brother-in-law of Henry VIII to the House of Howard and all for which it stood, finally brought about (if Seymour's influence were not solely responsible for) the imprisonment of the Duke of Norfolk and the execution of the Earl of Surrey.

v. This destiny, however, was unknown in 1536. The adversities of this year to the Howards were interrupted the first of July. At the house of Thomas Manners, Earl of Rutland, in Holywell on 3 July was celebrated a triple wedding which momentarily stimulated the hopes of the chief family of the old nobility. At this time Baron Bulbeck, son and heir of the Earl of Oxford (Surrey's father-in-law) married Lady Dorothy, eldest daughter of the Earl of Westmorland (Surrey's uncle); the Earl of Westmorland's son and heir, called Lord Neville, married the Earl of Rutland's eldest daughter, Lady Anne; the Earl of Rutland's son and heir, called Lord Roos, married the Earl of Westmorland's daughter, Lady Margaret. Surrey attended the wedding and took part in the ceremony. He led his cousin, the new Lady Roos, from the church to the house of her father-in-law. There was held the joyful celebration, in which the Duke of Norfolk, the Duke of Suffolk, the Earl of Derby, and other

<sup>10</sup> *L. & P.*, X, 1000.

distinguished men took part. Even the King came from York Place to attend the wedding festival and smiled on the whole affair.<sup>11</sup> To the Howards the union of so many of their relatives gave promise of greater harmony within the family. Internal dissension dispelled from their ranks, they could take a firmer stand against the encroachments of their rivals.

vi. But the reverses to the Howards during the year 1536 had only begun. Shortly after the execution of Queen Anne, Lord Thomas Howard, the half-brother of the Duke of Norfolk, had secretly married Lady Margaret Douglas.<sup>12</sup> She was the daughter of Henry VIII's sister, Margaret, who had first married James IV of Scotland. After James's death, she had married another Scotsman, Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus. As both Princess Mary and Princess Elizabeth had been declared illegitimate by acts of Parliament, in 1536 the children of Margaret Tudor were the only legitimate offspring in the Tudor family. Because of this parliamentary action, the only existing heirs of Henry VIII were James V of Scotland and Lady Margaret Douglas. As her mother had been in England when Lady Margaret was born, her claim to be the heir to the Tudor throne of England was considered to take precedence over that of James V, who had been born in Scotland.

When Henry VIII learned of the secret marriage of Lord Thomas Howard to Lady Margaret Douglas he was incensed that a subject had dared to marry into the royal family without his permission. On 18 July, 1536, Lord Thomas Howard was thrown into the Tower and attainted for high treason, "the presumption being that he aspired to the crown by reason of so high a marriage."<sup>13</sup> Separated from her husband, the Lady Margaret was also confined in the Tower until the death of the disgraced Lord Thomas Howard on 31 October, 1537.<sup>14</sup>

vii. Another and more serious calamity to Surrey occurred immediately after his half-uncle was attainted. On 22 July the

<sup>11</sup> Wriothesley, I, 50.

<sup>12</sup> Hall, p. 819.

<sup>13</sup> J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng. 1529-1603*, II (London, 1856), p. 501.

<sup>14</sup> Henry Ellis, *Original Letters*, 3rd series (London, 1846), III, 135; Lord Herbert p. 400.

Duke of Richmond, never having lived with his Howard wife, died at the palace of St. James.<sup>15</sup> It was decided that the body of this illegitimate but favored son of Henry VIII should be interred in the church at Thetford, where so many of the Howards were buried. Broken-hearted because of the death of his brother-in-law, who had been his childhood companion, Surrey returned to Kenninghall, which is near Thetford, to take part in the funeral. The Duke of Norfolk also left the court to be present at the ceremony.

Another of Surrey's friends, and his strongest personal claim for the King's favor, was gone. Surrey's grief for the loss of his dearest friend was deep and genuine. A year later the Duke of Norfolk wrote, "[My] son of Surrey is very weak, his nature running from him abundantly. 'He was in that case a great part of the last year, [which] . . . came to him for thought of [the death of] my lord of Richmond'." <sup>16</sup>

viii. Surrey remained in the country after the funeral at Thetford to readjust himself to the new circumstances of his position and to overcome his grief. He and his father were both at Kenninghall when the rebellion known as the Pilgrimage of Grace broke out in the north.<sup>17</sup> This revolt against Henry VIII's policies was both a boon and a calamity to the Howards. Because Henry VIII could not do without their military leadership and support at such a time, the outbreak which began at Caistor in Lincolnshire on 3 October, 1536, restored the position of the Howards at court. On the other hand, the reforms which the revolting people demanded—the reestablishment of the nobility as an actual power; the suppression of the upstart statesmen, such as Cromwell and Rich were and Wolsey had been; the return to the old religion; the restoration of the monasteries<sup>18</sup> (the suppression of which had begun in this year)—were demands which the Duke of Norfolk and his son strongly sanctioned.

Henry VIII moved to eradicate this revolt against his author-

<sup>15</sup> Holinshed, IV, 1565; *Camden Miscellany*, III, pp. lxxvii-lxxviii; see also p.c.

<sup>16</sup> *L. & P.*, XII, ii, 248.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 580.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, pp. 353-354.



ity with his customary discretion. He fully understood that the sympathies of the Howards were with the demands of the people of the north. But he also knew the Howard tradition of adherence to established authority. The Duke of Norfolk and his son were given no opportunity to disregard this tradition. First the Privy Council wrote to the Duke and to Surrey, ordering them to raise and equip horsemen to assist in suppressing the rebellion. Then the King ordered the Duke to send Surrey to lead these forces north, the Duke himself to remain at home to ensure the loyalty of the family. This was merely the King's discreet way of reminding Norfolk that his lands and estates were in the control of his King. The Duke protested vigorously against this distrust, as Henry VIII had doubtless intended that he should do. The order was changed. The Duke was placed in command of the troops with instructions to move to the north. It was made plain in the orders, however, that Surrey must remain at home.<sup>19</sup>

The Duke set out for the rebellion by way of Lincolnshire on 11 October. At the same time he wrote to the Council requesting that his eldest son be permitted to accompany him. Without awaiting a reply, Surrey started with his father. The Council, not yet entirely satisfied of the loyalty of the Howards—or not wishing to take the slightest risk of their loyalty—promptly denied this permission. The Duke of Norfolk was ordered “to cause [Surrey] to stay where he shall be on the receipt of this, without marching further forward,” as the traitors had gone home.<sup>20</sup> The latter part of this statement was merely to excuse the retention of Surrey at Cambridge. The Lincolnshire rebels had dispersed, but a far more serious outbreak was affecting nearly the whole of Yorkshire. The Duke was ordered to proceed north with his forces. He did so, but received little support. The movement of troops was difficult in those days, and facilities for their swift transportation were entirely lacking. Norfolk apparently had no choice but to arrange terms with the rebels. Without much fighting, on 7 October he concluded an armistice with them.

<sup>19</sup> *L. & P.*, XI, 580, 601, 602.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 701; see also 659, 727, 864; *S.P.*, *Henry VIII*, I, ii, 63.

The armistice permitted a deputation to proceed in peace to lay the grievances of the revolting people before the King. This deputation was graciously received, but with diplomatic phrases Henry VIII denied their claims in a document which he drew up in his own hand. Beginning this document by saying that the statements of the rebels' grievances were "so general that hard they be to be answered" Henry took exception to all their accusations. He then denounced the rebellion and the "lewd proclamations" to which it had given rise. His Majesty concluded:

But to show our pity, we are content, if we find you penitent, to grant you all letters of pardon on your delivering to us 10 such ringleaders of this rebellion as we shall assign to you. Now note the benignity of your Prince, and how easily bloodshed may be eschewed. Thus, I as your head pray for you, my members, that God may enlighten you for your benefit.<sup>21</sup>

Norfolk's actions in the north were evidently satisfactory. He was commanded to remain in charge of the King's forces there, and soon after the conclusion of the armistice Surrey was permitted to join his father. In the north they remained until spring opened, when Surrey returned south. In May his father sent again for him, again without requesting permission to do so. As rebellion was rekindling in the north, Surrey's presence there aroused vigorous protests from the Court. On 9 May, 1537, Norfolk wrote to Henry VIII to justify his sending for Surrey.<sup>22</sup> He not only loved his son, he explained, but he needed Surrey's help in order to keep his inactive men together. The accusations of others that he had brought Surrey there to teach him and to give him command as his deputy, the Duke protested, were utterly false. Nevertheless, Surrey soon returned south, for on 12 July he was at Kenninghall in ill health.<sup>23</sup>

ix. By the summer of 1537, Surrey was no longer merely a symbolic entity in the strife for power in England. Having been the Duke of Norfolk's marionette for twenty years, the manikin became a man, and for the first time the records offer evidence

<sup>21</sup> *L. & P.*, XI, 957.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, i, 1162; also 141, 777, 1157, 1192.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, ii, 248.

that Surrey had a mind and a will of his own, that he could and would form his own judgments and act upon them.

Thomas, Lord Darcy, after having been pardoned for his first association with the Pilgrimage of Grace, had again taken up arms against the King. When the renewed revolt had been swiftly and forcibly suppressed by the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Darcy was again arrested, brought to trial for his second offence, condemned to death, and decapitated on Tower Hill, 30 June, 1537. In his final testimony he had declared—probably with some truth<sup>24</sup>—that both Norfolk and Surrey, although they had acted to put down the uprising, were in sympathy with the rebels.<sup>25</sup>

Knowledge of this charge had probably been the cause of the protests against Surrey's presence in the north, and after Darcy's execution the emphasis given to the accusation by his rivals imperiled the position of the Howards and necessitated their promptly offering some proof of their staunch loyalty to the throne. To refute such dangerous slanders by demonstrating to Henry VIII how horrified were the Howards by even the suggestion that they could hold treasonable sympathies, Surrey—with what has been, I am convinced, mistakenly interpreted as foolhardy impulsiveness—successfully hazarded the loss of his right hand.

The evidence that Surrey did so is contained in a letter of 8 August, 1537, which was written by the Duke of Norfolk to Cromwell, Lord Privy Seal since 1536. In it the Duke admitted: If I shold reherse unto you the multitude of prickcs of agonye that ar in my hert, I shold molest you with too tediousse and long a letter; but for a fewe of them: what chawncs of informations hath be of my sonne falsely ymaged, no man knoweth better than ye. And now to amende the same in my hert, by chawnce of lightlihode to be maymed of his right arme.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> See above, p. 57.

<sup>25</sup> *L. & P.*, XI, 21; Norfolk to Cromwell, 3 July: "I cannot express how much I think myself bound to you for your kind handling of my causes; and now of late concerning the lord Darcy and my son, his false surmise made against him (as I think)." Help my daughter's cause to a good end." Although *L. & P.* assigns this letter to 1536, it could not have been written before 1537, for the Duke's daughter, the Duchess of Richmond, could not have been seeking her dowry before the death of her husband July 22, 1536.

<sup>26</sup> *S.P.*, Henry VIII. V. 325.

Although I disagree with Bapst's explanation of Surrey's motives, the hypothesis which he offers<sup>27</sup> to explain the situation to which the Duke referred seems adequate: Jane Seymour's marriage to Henry VIII had placed much influence in the hands of her base-born relatives, who thus became the leaders of the faction which opposed the influence of the Howards and sought to usurp more and more of the power which had been held by the old nobility. As the Seymours' rise had to be at the expense of the Howards, Lord Darcy's public accusations were opportune to them. According to Bapst's hypothesis, at the instigation of Sir Edward Seymour, at this time Viscount Beauchamp, Darcy's remarks were widely repeated at court. When knowledge of this instigation reached Surrey, about a fortnight after Darcy's execution, he was incensed that a "new man," one so recently raised from mediocrity, should dare to propagate such statements. Therefore, Bapst believes, Surrey lost his head completely and rushed to the Court in search of Seymour. Blind with rage and heedless of consequences to himself, when he found his enemy in the park of Hampton Court, where the King was then in residence, Surrey struck him and probably challenged him to mortal combat. As Surrey well knew, physical violence within the precincts of the Court was considered to impair the dignity of the king and the safety of his person. The doer thereof was subject "not onelie [to be] iudged to lose his [right] hand, but also his bodie to remaine in prison, and his lands and goods at the kings pleasure."<sup>28</sup> Therefore, Surrey was immediately seized by the guard and held as subject to this stringent punishment, which traditional ritual dictated was to be inflicted as follows:

The doer of violence in the precincts of the court should be tried and sentenced with dispatch. Immediately thereafter was called to do the execution: first, the sergeant surgion with his instruments appertaining to his office; the sergeant of the wood-

<sup>27</sup> Bapst, pp. 226-231.

<sup>28</sup> Holinshed (ed. 1587), III, p. 953. "An Acte for Murther and malicious Bloudshed within the Courte," A.D. 1541-42 (33 Hen. 8. c. 9), printed in *The Statutes*, 2nd revised edition (London, 1888), I, 379 ff., does not, as has been cited against Bapst's hypothesis, institute a new law; it was enacted to define jurisdiction in such cases.

yard with the mallet and a blocke wherevpon the hand should lie; the maister-cooke for the king, with the knife; the sergeant of the larder, to set the knife right on the ioint; the sergeant ferrer, with the searing irons to seare the veines; the sergeant of the poultrie, with a cocke, which cocke should haue his head smitten off vpon the same blocke and with the same knife; the yeoman of the chandrie, with seare cloths; the yeoman of the scullerie, with a pan of fire to heate the irons, a chafer of water to coole the ends of the irons, and two formes for all officers to set their stuffe on; the sergeant of the cellar, with wine, ale, and beere; the yeoman of the yewrie . . . , with basin, ewre, and towels.<sup>29</sup>

Each of these officials having arrived with the necessities of his office, the sentence should be executed without more ado.

Bapst presents convincingly his hypothesis that Surrey's "chawnce of lightlihode to be maymed of his right arme" was the result of his having struck Edward Seymour in the precincts of the Court in 1537,<sup>30</sup> but I doubt his contention that Surrey acted on blind impulse. In fact, several circumstances indicate strongly that Surrey may have been acting with bold acumen. First, knowledge that such charges were being repeated at court against the Howards could not have come as a surprise to Surrey in July, 1537. As early as February such charges were being bandied about,<sup>31</sup> and only those who are unfamiliar with the care the Duke of Norfolk took to keep informed of what was taking place at court, even when absent, can believe that either the leader of the Howards or his heir remained for six months in ignorance of this court gossip. Second, the result of Surrey's action tends to discredit the interpretation that he had been foolhardy. No man of eminence had previously in the reign of Henry VIII suffered such punishment<sup>32</sup>—and Surrey was not so punished. He was merely confined to the grounds of Windsor Castle for a time,<sup>33</sup> and Henry VIII paid no heed to the accusation. Moreover, the records offer negative evidence that at

<sup>29</sup> Holinshed (ed. 1587), III, p. 953.

<sup>30</sup> Nott, pp. lxxxvii-lxxxix, upon no acceptable evidence, assigns Surrey's imprisonment at Windsor to the summer of 1546.

<sup>31</sup> *L. & P.*, XII, i, 424.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. T. B. Howell, *Complete Collection of State Trials* (London, 1816), I, 443.

<sup>33</sup> The testimony of the Duchess of Richmond in 1546 furnishes additional evidence that Surrey was at one time confined at Windsor; Ford Herbert n. 564.

court repetition of the charge ceased abruptly. Third, the success with which Surrey repeatedly used attack as the best means of defense<sup>34</sup> does not prove that he always acted upon forethought, but under the circumstances it does suggest that he may have deliberately chosen to protect the lives and the influence of the members of his family by making himself liable to such dire punishment in order to demonstrate to Henry VIII how strongly the Howards resented even the suggestion that they were not loyal to the crown. At least the events which followed for almost a decade show the Howard star waxing and the influence of the Duke of Norfolk and his heir at its strongest.

Whatever the explanation we conjecture to explain Surrey's striking an enemy within the precincts of the Court, he did not lose his right arm. Instead, it seems, he was merely imprisoned at Windsor Castle.<sup>35</sup> Conveyed there, he was given the freedom of the castle ground, where he had spent so many happy hours during his boyhood, but not permitted to pass outside the walls.<sup>36</sup> Probably he relieved the tedium of his confinement by literary exercises. "So cruell prison, how coulde betide, alas!" seems to contain internal evidence that it was written at this time. And his imagination coloring his memories of boyhood pleasures shared with the Duke of Richmond, perhaps he also wrote the sonnet beginning "When Windsor walles susteyned my wearied arme."<sup>37</sup>

How long Surrey was confined we do not know. His name disappears from the records for almost three months, but by October he was again free and at Kenninghall.<sup>38</sup>

## x. On the eve of the feast of St. Edward, 12 October, 1537,

<sup>34</sup> See below, the account of his military career.

<sup>35</sup> According to the long accredited tradition, now known to be entirely fictitious, it was during the summer of 1537 that Surrey visited Italy as the champion of "The Faire Geraldine." See below, Appendix II.

<sup>36</sup> Bapst, p. 229, explains, "*Ce n'était pas pour le Comte un emprisonnement véritable; il restait libre de ses mouvements dans le château et le parc y attenant; seulement il avait la défense de s'éloigner.*" That Surrey was merely confined, and not imprisoned, at Windsor would explain the absence of records of his being ordered to remain there.

<sup>37</sup> It is suggested that at this time he also adapted "Of thy lyfe, Thomas" (Arber, p. 27) from Horace, Book II, Ode 10; but cf. Bapst, p. 229; and Padelford, p. 226.

<sup>38</sup> *L. & P.*, XII, ii, 839.

Queen Jane Seymour gave birth to a son, and at last Henry had a male heir to succeed him. The date of his birth determined the name of the child, who lived to become Edward VI; whereas the mother died soon afterwards, probably from an infection contracted in child-bed.

The death of the Seymour queen, which occurred on 24 October, removed an impediment to the influence of the Howards. The Duke of Norfolk made what use he could immediately of the opportunity. From the north, where he had been forced to remain all the previous winter in spite of his vigorous protests, the Duke had without permission started to court early in October. To Surrey at Kenninghall he had also sent instructions to join him at Ware.<sup>39</sup> When news of the Queen's illness first reached the Duke, or exactly when he and his son reached the Court, we do not know; but the Duke arrived at Hampton Court before death did.<sup>39a</sup> And both he and his son were well received there and soon assigned to official positions in the ceremonies of mourning for the deceased Queen. At the funeral, 12 November, 1537, Surrey acted as an "assistant about the corpse and chair."<sup>40</sup>

xi. Very few records of Surrey's actions during the year following have been preserved. On New Year's Day, 1538, he made a gift to the King of "three gilt bowls with a cover, having thereupon a double rose, the shanks of the bowls chased up-right and the feet graven in one pane."<sup>41</sup> Having reached his majority, he could no longer escape making his contribution to the King's coffers.

On 25 February, Surrey's second son was born. "Notwithstanding that she [the Countess of Surrey] Loked not to haue ben deluyered vnto after Palme sondaie," the Duke of Norfolk wrote to Cromwell, "yet god be thanked the childe is as Lustye a boye as nedeth to be."<sup>42</sup> This son was named Henry; for his grandfather had intended,

if she [his daughter of Surrey] had gon her full rekenyng, and then

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 1060 & 1012.

<sup>42</sup> P.R.O., St. P., Henry VIII, CXXX, 43.

<sup>39a</sup> *Ibid.*, 971.

<sup>41</sup> Nott, p. xliii.

had a Sone, . . . to haue sent to the kinges highnes to haue beseched hym to haue had it [the child] christened in his name [to be godfather to the child], . . . but bycause she was so long delyuered before her rekenyng, the women here [at Kenninghall] wold not suffre me [the Duke] to Let the childe be so long vnchristened.<sup>43</sup>

In March a royal grant was made to Surrey which caused him to be one of the Commissioners of Sewers.<sup>44</sup> Another government record referring to Surrey's movements tells us that on 20 September, the Duke of Norfolk being ill, Surrey was sent in his stead to Norwich to take the surrender of the Grey Friars.<sup>45</sup> Before the end of the year the Duke of Norfolk made grants "to my wife and my son" of four hundred pounds a year.<sup>46</sup>

xii. As Surrey's movements during 1538 have found little place in government records, we infer that he spent most of the year in retirement in the country. He had grown into a handsome young man with a charming personality, but his childhood had impressed upon him the importance of his birthright without teaching him to dissemble his conception of his rights and duties. Consequently, he could be generous towards and considerate of his inferiors, but he expected the newly created peers to respect his nobler blood. If one compares him with other people of the courts of this age, he seems unusually uninterested in winning grants, privileges, and offices to which he was not traditionally entitled; yet he could not dissemble, would not acknowledge the demands of expediency. Probably the Duke of Norfolk—who was always a pragmatist and willing to subjugate his inherited rights to the necessity of the moment—guessed that his eldest son might at this time interfere with his baiting grapple hooks to fish the rapids of court intrigue and took pains to see that Surrey passed most of the year in Norfolk.

As Kenninghall offered few activities to hold the attention

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* Trials and tribulations beset this Henry Howard during the greater part of the reign of Elizabeth, but he survived to be created Baron Howard of Marnhill and Earl of Northampton soon after James I ascended the English throne.

<sup>44</sup> *L. & P.*, XIII, i, 646 (48).

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, ii, 399.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 1215.



of a young man who had lived most of his teens at the courts of England and of France, for want of other interests Surrey probably turned to literature, gave his time to scribbling verse, and began the experiments which produced English blank verse.<sup>47</sup> *Verso sciolto*, Italian blank verse, had become extremely popular as a verse form with the Italian poets of the early sixteenth century. Surrey had become acquainted with their usage of the form during his sojourn in France. While he visited the French Court, Luigi Alamanni, a Florentine poet who wrote a number of poems in *verso sciolto*, was also there; moreover, Alamanni's *Opere Toscane*, dedicated to Francis I, was published at this time (1532). This contained many poems in blank verse, as well as "sonnets, ballades, and other amatory poems in rhyme; eclogues after the manner of Theocritus; . . . hymns in imitation of Pindar, the first of their kind; the penitential Psalms; and satires in terza rima."<sup>48</sup> Surrey presumably met Alamanni at the French Court, and it seems highly probable that this Italian poet's book aroused his interest.

Surrey's poetic experimentations with *verso sciolto*, whether or not he began his translation of either Book II or IV of *The Æneid* at Kenninghall in 1538, led to his most important contribution to English metrical forms—the unrimed iambic pentameter line, English blank verse, of which J. S. Symonds<sup>49</sup> writes:

[It] is, perhaps, more various and plastic than any other national metre. It is capable of being used for the most commonplace and the most sublime utterances; so that, without any alteration in the vehicle, we pass from merely colloquial dialogue to strains of impassioned soliloquy, from comic repartee to tragic eloquence, from terse epigrams to elaborate descriptions.

Surrey originated this metrical form. His translations of Books II and IV of Virgil's *Æneid* were the first English poetry

<sup>47</sup> The strongest argument in favor of this conjecture is that this is one of the few periods in the mature Surrey's life when he was free for any length of time from political or military duties; (but see also Bapst, p. 234 ff.; & Padelford, p. 233 ff.) More critical details concerning Surrey's blank verse are given below, p. 234 ff.

<sup>48</sup> Henry Morley, *First Sketch of Eng. Lit.* (London, 1912), p. 229.

<sup>49</sup> *Blank Verse* (London, 1895), p. 16.

written in blank verse.<sup>50</sup> And although it cannot be maintained that he was the master of this medium, which he initiated, there were present in Surrey's blank verse all the possible metrical variations—the trochee (initial or within the line), the anapest, the irregular foot, the shifting cæsura, the run-on line, and the broken line—for those English poets who came after him to master in order to demonstrate the greatness and the infinite possibilities of English blank verse.

xiii. During the summer of 1538 the Duke of Norfolk again sought to strengthen his position by marriage alliance. His plan was to marry his daughter Mary, the widowed Duchess of Richmond, to Sir Thomas Seymour. This marriage, the Duke hoped, would place greater authority in the hands of the nobility by destroying the rivalry between the Howards and the Seymours. Although the Duke of Norfolk was inimical to all such "new men", and to their religious views and political aspirations, he was diplomatic. The experience of his childhood and youth had taught him the difficulty of regaining an eminent position once it had been lost; accordingly, his practice was to yield to the necessity of the moment in order to retain the position which would enable him to assert and to forward his interests and his beliefs when the opportunity offered or could be created.

With circumspection the Duke of Norfolk forwarded his project of another advantageous matrimonial alliance. His conscience, well trained in casuistry, permitted him to make the statement, "There ensueth comenly no grete good by conjunction of grete bloodes togyther."<sup>51</sup> This doctrine, although perhaps eugenically correct, was not the philosophy which had commonly governed Howard marriages after their blood had become "grete."

The Duke's discreet advances in this matter were well re-

<sup>50</sup> The possibility of Nicholas Grimald's having written unrimed five-stressed verse as early does, of course, exist, as we have no conclusive evidence of the date either man first used this metrical form, but at least Surrey's translation of Book IV of the *Æneid* was the first published English blank verse. (For summary of the evidence that *The Fourth Boke of Virgill* was published in 1554 see the introduction of the Pforzheimer edition (1933) edited by Herbert Hartman.)

<sup>51</sup> *S.P., Henry VIII*, I, ii, 107.

ceived. Sir Thomas Seymour proved acquiescent. Cromwell also favored the alliance. He hoped that this might be a means of mitigating the Howard opposition to the Reformation; perhaps, having concluded this alliance, he could even win the Howard support of his policies by judicious concessions and bribing grants.

The marriage of the Duchess of Richmond to Sir Thomas Seymour was suggested to the King by Cromwell, and his persuasions were successful. The King looked with favor upon the match and charged Cromwell to conclude it if possible.<sup>52</sup> The Duchess of Richmond's consent, however, was not so easily gained. She had only recently received her dowry as the widow of the Duke of Richmond, the King having withheld it for almost two years after Richmond's death. Having much of the arrogance of her mother, she probably did not want to give up her newly acquired independence. Nevertheless, in spite of her lack of inclination for this marriage, Cromwell was apparently winning her to a more favorable view when she suddenly left the court to return to Kenninghall. The reason for this abrupt departure is not known.<sup>53</sup> Perhaps she went to consult her brother, Surrey, who was there. If so, Surrey's personal dislike of the Seymours, which dated from his imprisonment in the previous year, and his habitual refusal to compromise would certainly have led him to oppose such a marriage.<sup>54</sup> Whatever the motives prompting her rejection of the hand of Sir Thomas Seymour, the Duchess remained a widow at this time.

xiv. The situation of England in foreign political affairs was critical during the winter of 1538-1539. In the autumn of 1537 the hostilities between Charles V and Francis I had almost dwindled away in spite of Henry VIII's efforts to keep between them the state of open war which had prevented either of these Continental monarchs from being able to use the English revolt, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, to Henry's disadvantage. Failing to keep them at war, Henry sought to bind one or the

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Bapst, p. 238.

<sup>54</sup> The Duchess of Richmond's testimony to the contrary (Lord Herbert, p. 563) refers, I believe, to a later incident; see below, p. 197.

other to his interests by a marriage alliance. Knowledge that Mary of Guise had been promised to James V of Scotland did not deter him from sending envoys to Francis to request her hand. This was refused. Although he was at the same time negotiating for a bride in the Netherlands, Henry then asked for a list of eligible French maidens that he might inspect them in person. Meanwhile, Francis's instructions to Castillon, his ambassador at the English Court, caused Castillon to let Henry "know that without seeking for five feet on one sheep," the amity of the French King was more to the English King than the amity of Henry was to Francis.<sup>55</sup> Refusing to admit the fact, Henry VIII renewed on 12 August, 1538, his suggestion that arrangements be made to permit him to inspect the persons of French maidens eligible to be his wife. In reply, the French Ambassador protested that Francis "did not think it honourable to bring the ladies to Calais, but that [Henry] should send some trustworthy personages to report." "By God!" said Henry, "I trust no one but myself. The thing touches me too near. I wish to see them and know them some time before deciding." Half laughing, Castillon replied:

Ne voudriez vous point, Sire, encores monter sur toutes l'une apres l'autre et apres retenir pour vostre personne celle qui yroit le plus doux? Les Chevaliers de la Table Ronde traictoient-ilz point ainsi du temps passé les dames en ce pays?

The diplomatic satire "shamed" the English King, Castillon concluded in his report to Francis, "for he laughed and blushed at the same time, and recognized then that the way he had taken was a little discourteous."<sup>56</sup> "For Henry VIII," as Thomas Warton<sup>57</sup> later characterized him, "with many boisterous qualities, was magnificent and affable. Had he never murdered his wives, his politeness to the fair sex would remain unimpeached."

xv. Henry VIII's intrigues, matrimonial and political, failed.

<sup>55</sup> *L. & P.*, XIII, ii, 77.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.* This report from Castillon to Francis I, furnishes all the words quoted above in the paragraph.

<sup>57</sup> *Hist. of Eng. Poetry* (London, 1781), III, 2.

In the autumn of 1538 he was confronted by a hostile league of the Empire, France, and Scotland. Pope Paul III issued the long delayed Bull of Excommunication against the English King. This was the bull, with some additions, which had been drawn up in August, 1535.<sup>58</sup> The immediate cause of the issuing of the papal bull in December, 1538, would seem to have been the destruction of the holy shrines in England, which included the razing in October of the famous shrine of St. Thomas à Becket at Canterbury. The actual motive, however, was His Holiness's hope that the hostile league against England might at this time enforce recognition of the temporal authority of the papacy.

These circumstances again made the military abilities of the House of Howard absolutely essential to Henry VIII. Consequently, even the slightest trace of doubt disappeared from the King's attitude towards them. The Duke of Norfolk's influence in the government councils increased; Surrey returned to court; and Mary Howard's claims as the wife of the deceased Duke of Richmond were at last acknowledged.<sup>59</sup>

An attempt by the hostile league to invade England was feared. Henry VIII began to strengthen his defences all over his island kingdom. Surrey was sent to Norfolk in March, 1539, to build up the defences in those parts.<sup>60</sup> His work there was to take musters, to build and repair beacons, to see that ordnance was supplied wherever needed, and to make lists of ships, mariners, and defenders of every port.

Surrey's duties carried him all over Norfolk, but on 18 April he was at Kenninghall. At this time he assisted in an unsuccessful attempt to allay a sudden quarrel between Sir Edmund Knevet and Sir Richard Southwell over an election dispute. The intervention of Surrey, Sir Thomas Strange, and others caused Southwell to be willing to make up the quarrel, "but no persuasion . . . could bring Knevet to conformity."<sup>61</sup> The

<sup>58</sup> A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 302, note 2: "The bull of excommunication was eventually dated 30th August, 1535 . . . , and a bull depriving Henry of his kingdom was sanctioned, printed, and prepared for publication . . . , but first Francis and then Charles put difficulties in the way. In December, 1538, Paul III, now that he, Charles, and Francis were united in the bond of friendship, published with additions the bull of August, 1535 . . . Even then no bull of deprivation was published."

<sup>59</sup> "Lord Northampton MS. 437"; printed by Nott, app. XXXVII.

<sup>60</sup> *L. & P.*, XIV, i, 529.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 800.

antagonists were then ordered by the Duke of Norfolk to appear before the Privy Council. When they reached the Court, Knevet committed the same crime for which, we conjecture, Surrey had been imprisoned in 1537. He broke the law prohibiting violence in the environs of the King's person.<sup>62</sup> Forgetting where he was, Knevet struck John Clere, Surrey's squire, who had escorted him to the Court. The original charge against Knevet was lost sight of because of this greater offence. He was immediately seized, tried, and condemned to lose his right hand. But the intervention of Surrey, the influence of the Duke of Norfolk, and Knevet's own request that his left hand be cut off rather than his right in order that he might continue to serve his King saved him from this mutilation.

xvi. The forming of the hostile alliance against him caused Henry VIII to make some changes in his domestic policy. During the summer of 1538 Henry had made some advances towards a political union with the Lutherans. The majority of Englishmen disagreed violently with German orthodoxy. On the Continent in January, 1539, the ruin of England was talked of as imminent. It was thought that, by and large, the English people would welcome an invasion by the "Most Catholic Monarchs" of France and Spain to free them from their Reformation King. But the Continentals little understood conditions in England. Politically at least, nationalism had superseded papal authority in the minds of the English people. This enabled Henry VIII to bind all forces of England together to resist any attempted invasion.

With consummate skill the English King dispelled the internal dissension which threatened disruption. At the Parliament which opened on 28 April, 1539, Henry VIII caused acts to be passed which gave hope to the Party of Insurrection (open or secret Romanists), satisfied the Anglicans (strictly orthodox in the Catholic faith but content to be separated from Rome),

<sup>62</sup> Holinshed (ed. 1587), III, 953; where this greater crime is assigned to 10 June, 33 Henry VIII. The later date may be correct, but the circumstances of Knevet's being ordered to appear before the Privy Council in 1539 suggest that the first difficulty led to the second.

and indulged the Reformation Party. One act of Parliament confirmed the surrender of all religious houses and ended the monastic life in England. The new order of nobles, who were mostly of the Reformation Party, received a great part of the forfeited wealth of the monasteries. The "new men" were pleased, although the next act was quite contrary to the wishes of the Reformation Party. Parliament also sanctioned the Act of Six Articles, introduced by the Duke of Norfolk. This act, with the approval of Henry VIII, proclaimed the retention in England of strict Catholic orthodoxy in matters of faith. The Anglicans were completely satisfied and the Party of Insurrection made hopeful. Demonstrating the confidence which was placed in Henry VIII by the English, Parliament also gave him power to issue proclamations which were to be invested with the authority of statutes. The King then prorogued Parliament with the intimation that the religious question was not yet definitely settled.

The Act of Six Articles provided for enforcement. "Deep in the hearts of all Englishmen in that [the sixteenth] century lay the conviction that it was the duty of the magistrate to maintain truth, as well as to execute justice. Toleration was neither understood or desired."<sup>63</sup> As did the Puritans who came to America a century later, each Englishman sought freedom to worship his God as he chose, but each was at the same time eager and willing to enforce the tenets and forms of his religion on all others. In 1539 stringent measures were immediately undertaken by the Duke of Norfolk and other conservative peers and bishops to enforce the Act of Six Articles. Within a fortnight five hundred persons had been indicted in London for heresy. Many of these were summarily convicted and burned. The people approved heartily.

The Party of the Reformation hoped to moderate this stringent enforcement of the orthodox faith by binding Henry VIII in a Protestant marriage. Ever since the death of Jane Seymour the people had been urging Henry VIII to take another wife. They wanted their King to beget other legitimate male heirs in order to make secure the succession of the English crown if

<sup>63</sup> J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1529-1603 (London, 1856-1870), III, 66.

Prince Edward should die. Parliament had gone so far as to petition Henry VIII to marry again soon.

Henry was willing to marry again, but he was seeking to gain the greatest possible advantage by his choice of a bride. In June, 1539, he had not despaired of thus making an alliance with the French King or with the Spanish Emperor. To advertise his openness of mind, Henry VIII ordered performed at St. Paul's in London "a great and solemn obit[uary ceremony] . . . for the Empresse, late wife [of that most Catholic monarch], Charles the Fift."<sup>64</sup> The Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Surrey, having been designated official mourners, took part in performing this rite on 7 June.

xvii. The power of the Howards and the party they represented was growing. The influence of Cromwell and the Reformation Party was seemingly on the wane. A reaction against too rapid change had set in. The threat of an immediate invasion of England was past by August, 1539, when the King granted the Forest of Ashdown to Surrey<sup>65</sup> in acknowledgment of his services in Norfolk.

The prospect of a French or of a Spanish marriage for Henry VIII had also dwindled away by this time. Being unable to break the amity between Francis and Charles, Henry turned again to the possibilities of a union with the Protestant princes of Germany. Cromwell seized this opportunity to maintain his position by arranging Henry VIII's marriage to a Protestant wife. For this purpose Cromwell selected Anne of Cleves. She was the sister of the Duke of Cleves, who was closely allied to the Elector of Saxony and had some claims to the Duchy of Guelders. Throughout the autumn of 1539 Cromwell manoeuvred to conclude this marriage.

There was much opposition to Cromwell's Protestant plan. More than half the members of the Privy Council, including the Duke of Norfolk, were violently opposed to this marriage, although the religion of the Duke of Cleves was not, in the strict meaning of the terms, Lutheran or Protestant. The continued friendship between Charles V and Francis I, and the

<sup>64</sup> Wriothesley, I, 97-98.

<sup>65</sup> *L. & P.*, XIV, ii, 29.



decision of the Spanish Emperor to visit Paris, determined the issue. Although an English alliance with the German princes would be of but little assistance against the hostile alliance of Spain and France, Henry VIII decided that it was better than nothing. Cromwell's negotiations were accepted. Henry even agreed to forego a dowry because of the financial straits of the Duke of Cleves. On 6 October, 1539, the treaty of marriage was signed. In hope of winning the Howards to the Protestant cause, it was suggested that "if pledges were sent to Cleves, the Earl of Surrey should be one."<sup>66</sup> No pledges were sent, but Surrey was appointed to wait upon Henry VIII at the reception of the new Queen.<sup>67</sup>

In persuading Henry VIII to marry Anne of Cleves, Cromwell had told him that although she was thirty-four years old, every one praised her beauty, both of face and of body, and one said she excelled the Duchess of Milan as the golden sun did the silver moon.<sup>68</sup> Henry could not wait to see this paragon of beauty. Although his public reception of the new queen was to be held at Greenwich on 3 January, 1540, he went in disguise to meet her at Rochester the 31 December. Accompanied by only a few of his privy attendants,<sup>69</sup> including possibly the Earl of Surrey, the King "came suddenly into her presence." Anne was "sumwhat astonied, but after he had spokē & welcomed her, she . . . him recieued & welcomed on her knees."<sup>70</sup> Henry received a shock when he beheld Anne in the flesh. But he was a clever dissembler. He permitted no trace of his disappointment in her lack of beauty to be revealed as he raised Anne from her knees and kissed her.

Henry's aversion to Anne of Cleve's person did not become manifest at once. The public reception, in which members of the Howard family were assigned many honorable positions, was held at Greenwich. But the King voiced his distaste to his minion Cromwell in no uncertain terms and demanded of him a remedy. His Lord Chancellor and Vicegerent had none to offer. Nor did Cranmer, Norfolk, Suffolk, Southampton, or Tunstall, who were called upon the next day.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 400.

<sup>68</sup> *L. & P.*, XIV, i, 552.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 572; *Chronicle of Calais*, p. 175.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, XV, 14.

<sup>70</sup> Hall, p. 833.

To delay the marriage would offend the Duke of Cleves and the German princes. Charles V was consorting with Francis I in Paris. Henry VIII could not repudiate his Lutheran union, for to do so would sever the only alliance he had and present an ally to his rivals. Political expediency demanded that he marry the "Flanders Mare," and the ceremony was solemnized as scheduled, 6 January, 1540.

## CHAPTER V

### SCION OF THE HOWARDS

Henry's Protestant marriage, so opposed by the Howards and apparently so detrimental to their cause, proved the greatest boon they had received in years. The celebration of this marriage introduced the year of the culmination of the power and prestige of their house under Henry VIII. And soon after Henry's marriage to Anne of Cleves, Surrey found some relief from the financial difficulties which the illiberality of his father had inflicted upon him. Early in the year the "reversion and rent reserved on lease . . . of the house . . . [and lands] of Wymondham, Norf[olk]"<sup>1</sup> were granted to Surrey by the King.

The same month the Duke of Norfolk was sent on a political mission to France.<sup>2</sup> Henry VIII was still trying to alienate the monarchs of France and Spain from each other, and the Duke was sent to use his diplomacy to this end. As it would not be wise for Henry to repudiate another wife until this was accomplished, he urged Norfolk to do his utmost. Henry continued, accordingly, to hide his dislike for the person of his wife.

ii. The annual tournament to celebrate May Day was held this year in honor of the new Queen of England. The medieval tournament—the military exercise of knighthood in which the combatants, fighting with deadly weapons, not infrequently lost their lives—had by the sixteenth century become a sumptuous court spectacle where skill with knightly weapons was displayed with little danger to the participants. That of 1540 began with gorgeous pageantry.<sup>3</sup> An elaborate pavilion, covered with tapestries and hung on three sides with beautiful arras,

<sup>1</sup> *L. & P.*, XV, 1032.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 451.

<sup>3</sup> I know of no authentic detailed description of the May Day tournament in 1540, but thinking that some details of the knightly games as practiced in the sixteenth century would be of interest, I have drawn upon the records of other sixteenth-century tournaments for the following descriptive details. Surrey's part in the tournament, however, can be substantiated; see B.M., Harleian MS. No. 69, fol. 18; Wriothesley, I, 117 ff.; *L. & P.*, XV, 617.

had been raised above the galleries which surrounded the palisade of the lists. When all was ready, the King and Queen, with many attendants in cloth of gold, were conducted to this pavilion, where they seated themselves on thrones facing the lists. In a row at their Majesties' feet had been hung for all to see the eight shields of the knights who had been chosen to be the defenders in the jousts. The foremost of these shields bore the arms of the Earl of Surrey, for upon him had been bestowed the honor of being the Queen's Chief Defender in the Lists.

When their Majesties were in their places, the trumpets blew, and the fresh young gallants and noble knights, gorgeously apparelled, with elaborate devises embroidered in gold and silver on their white velvet coats and the trappings of their horses, entered the field to display their horsemanship by taking up and turning their horses as they circled the lists. Then came a large float, framed like a castle and wrought with fine cloth of gold, wherein was a lady bearing a shield of chryselephantine. She represented the Goddess of Arms. After the float followed the Earl of Surrey and his fellow defenders, armed at all points. The float being brought before their Majesties, the Goddess of Arms presented Surrey and his knights, whom she named her followers, and beseeched her Majesty, as Queen of the Tournament, to accept them as her defenders in the lists against all comers. This request was graciously granted.

Then came another band of horsemen well appointed, followed by eight knight challengers, of whom Sir John Dudley<sup>4</sup> was the chief. Sir John presented his company to the Queen, saying that his knights had come to do feats of arms for love of ladies, and besought licence for his challengers to prove themselves against the defenders. This request also was graciously granted.

After some further pageantry, the float was removed and the lists cleared. Whereupon the jousting began. The Earl of Surrey, being the Chief Defender, and Sir John Dudley, being the Chief Challenger, ran the first course. Retiring to their pavilions, each submitted himself to his squires, who closed the visors of

<sup>4</sup> Sir John Dudley was created Viscount Lisle in 1542 and in 1543 became Lord Admiral of England.

their master's helm, changed his steel-tipped spear for a tilting lance which was tipped with a coronal,<sup>5</sup> and adjusted his grand-guard.<sup>6</sup>

When they had been securely locked up in their steel harness Surrey and Sir John guided their horses to their proper places at opposite ends of the lists. Facing one another, each with the tilt<sup>7</sup> on his left hand, they laid their lances, which were held in the right hand, to rest on the left of their horses' heads. Then at the flourish of the trumpets, the knights put spurs to their horses. Each with his lance held on an angle across the tilt, they charged. Although both Surrey and Sir John were skilled in jousting and later either might attempt to strike his opponent's helmet, which was a more difficult and vulnerable target, as this was the first course of the tournament each chose the larger target of his opponent's grand-guard. Their horses were at full gallop when they met in the center of the lists. The coronal of Surrey's lance struck Sir John's grand-guard squarely at the same instant that Sir John's weapon struck him. The shock was great but both held true. Both lances were shattered, for both knights retained their seats. Great were the shouts and cheers from the galleries, for to strike your opponent in the lists so squarely that your lance shattered demonstrated that your aim was true; to remain in the saddle when your opponent's lance struck you so forcibly demonstrated the firmness of your seat; to do both at once was the supreme test of skill in the jousts. Both Surrey and Sir John had accomplished this feat. The jousts were excellently begun, and both defender and challenger were acclaimed with great applause as they retired to give others an opportunity to reveal their skill.

The jousts lasted two days. To his great honor, Surrey ran eight courses successfully on each day. Not once was he un-

<sup>5</sup> The coronal, or upper part of a jousting-lance, ended in three or four short spreading points, being constructed to unhorse, but not to wound, the knight.

<sup>6</sup> The grand-guard was a piece of plate armor covering the breast and left shoulder; it was affixed to the breast plate by screws and hooked on the helmet.

<sup>7</sup> The tilt was a stout wooden barrier extending the length of the lists. As he charged parallel to this barrier, each knight held his lance obliquely across it and attempted by thrusting to unhorse his opponent, who charged in the opposite direction on the other side of the barrier.

horsed, and he shattered his lance each time that his opponent succeeded in remaining in the saddle.

On 3 May the "tourney" began. In this martial game the knights on horseback fought all at once with swords. Thrusting was forbidden. Only certain striking blows with unsharpened swords were permitted the combatants, who were heavily armored. The object was to strike your opponent, or opponents, so forcibly as to knock him from his horse. The Chief of the twenty-nine defenders, Surrey acquitted himself with as much honor during the two days of the tourney as he had during the two days of the jousts.

The fifth day of the tournament was given over to "barriers," an exhibition in the lists of men fighting together on foot with short blunted swords. Surrey did not take part in this.

At the end of the tournament, their Majesties expressed great pleasure that both defenders and challengers, especially the chiefs of the two sides, had displayed such skill and prowess. As they had been so evenly matched, prizes consisting of arms, rich robes, and great silver vessels were distributed to all by the Queen of the Tournament.

iii. The crown did not remain on Anne of Cleves' head for long. Restraint of any kind was irksome to the mature Henry VIII, and a Protestant wife was a yoke upon his actions. The delayed rupture between Charles and Francis was imminent: In spite of his promise, Charles would not give up Milan to Francis. Probably he had never intended to do so. So long as was necessary, Henry dissembled, as by the honoring of Anne at the May Day celebration, the creating of Cromwell Earl of Essex, and the imprisonment of the Bishop of Chichester and two other opponents of the Reformation in the month of May, 1540. But before another month had passed Henry showed his hand. On 10 June Cromwell was arrested. The Duke of Norfolk took great pleasure in apprehending him at the council-table.<sup>8</sup> He was immediately conveyed to the Tower while his followers lamented and many more persons rejoiced. His cries for mercy

<sup>8</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 456; also the ms. notes opposite p. 422 of the Bodleian copy (Fol. Δ624) of this work.

aroused not the slightest sympathy. Parliament attainted him, unheard, of heresy and high treason on 19 July. When he was decapitated, 28 July, it was said that Surrey witnessed the execution and exclaimed, "Now is that foul churl dead [who was] so ambitious of others' blood. Now is he stricken with his own staff."<sup>9</sup>

While this was being performed Henry VIII also freed himself from the fourth woman he had taken to wife. He again declared that his conscience was troubling him. His marriage to Anne had only been made upon the condition that she obtain a release from her contract with the son of the Duke of Lorraine. As this release had not been received, he had scrupled to consummate the marriage. He appealed to "Our Church" to nullify this union. Anne prudently offered no opposition when Convocation declared the marriage null and void on 7 July. In recompense for the loss of a husband, Anne was endowed with four thousand pounds a year in lands and two country residences. She lived on friendly terms with Henry and his successors until 1558, when she died and was buried in Westminster Abbey.

iv. Urged by Parliament, Henry VIII lost no time in marrying a fifth wife. She was Surrey's cousin—Catherine Howard, the daughter of Lord Edmund Howard<sup>10</sup> and his first wife, Joyce Culpepper. The Duke of Norfolk and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, were instrumental in the selection of this bride. If her moral training had unhappily been somewhat neglected, her training in Catholic orthodoxy had not. She had been raised in the country, where the Reformation had made little progress. Before 1540 she was unfamiliar with court life. She was naive. Politics, religious controversy, and matrimonial intrigues were entirely unknown to her.<sup>11</sup>

When the Duke of Norfolk had learned that the King was displeased with Anne of Cleves he sent for Catherine Howard to be brought to London. Norfolk knew nothing of the bucolic love affairs in which this niece of his had indulged under the unseeing eye of her nun-like guardian, the Dowager Duchess

<sup>9</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 555 (1).

<sup>10</sup> Surrey's uncle, who had led the right wing at Flodden.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 397 ff.

of Norfolk. She was introduced to Henry VIII at the house of Bishop Gardiner. There and at Lambeth House she met him frequently in the late spring of 1540. With knowledge and skill Norfolk guided Catherine through Henry's courtship, using her as an instrument to hasten Henry in procuring his divorce from Anne and in discarding Cromwell.

Henry VIII was delighted with this beautiful and coy Howard maiden. The exact date of his marriage to her, which was celebrated privately, is unknown. July 21 is the date given by some. Perhaps this is exact, for on that day Henry VIII made a grant of apparel to Surrey,<sup>12</sup> who was again made cousin to the King by marriage. Whatever the date of the ceremony, the marriage of Henry VIII to Catherine Howard was announced 8 August, 1540. On that date she was "shewed openly as Quene at Hampton Court."<sup>13</sup>

The blood of the Howards was, in the eyes of the people, the noblest in England.

[The Howards] were a branch of the Plantagenet tree, and men thought of them as of something separate from the mass of subjects, even the greatest. In a fashion the Howards were senior to the Tudors; for though the Tudors had confirmed themselves also by a Plantagenet marriage, yet they were of very base blood.<sup>14</sup>

Henry VIII's choice of his fifth consort was looked upon with approval by all but the ardent supporters of the Reformation Party.

A Howard being Queen of England made the Howards again the first family in England in fact, as well as in name. And Henry VIII's frequent expressions of the satisfaction he found in his new queen made it appear that the Howards would retain this position.

v. The reviving fortunes of the House of Howard brought to the Earl of Surrey greater and greater distinctions. In the spring of 1541 he was dubbed knight.<sup>15</sup> Shortly afterwards the

<sup>12</sup> *L. & P.*, XV, 900.

<sup>13</sup> Hall, p. 840.

<sup>14</sup> Hilaire Belloc, *Wolsey* (Philadelphia & London, 1930), p. 73.

<sup>15</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Claudius, c. III, fol. 118 & 122. This is a chronological list of the dubbing of knights. Although Bapst (p. 232, note 2 & p. 248, note 3)



King conferred upon him the Order of the Garter,<sup>16</sup> the honor held to be the greatest acknowledgment of merit that Henry VIII could make.

The formal election of Surrey to be Knight of the Garter took place on 23 April, 1541,<sup>17</sup> at the annual St. George's Day Chapter of the Garter. Immediately after he had been elected the King called Surrey into his presence at Westminster.<sup>18</sup> When Surrey presented himself,

His Majesty, not forgetting the great Fidelity of this young knight towards him and his faithful discharge of his Duty, did for that reason, in a very engaging manner and in the way of a congratulatory oration, tell him that he was admitted by the Sovereign and Knights Companions of the Garter into that most noble Society in the expectation that his Virtue, which had already begun with such Luster, would increase from that time, and his Nobility would shine more and more in him every day.

Holding out the Garter to Surrey, the King continued:

Sir, the most friendly Companions of this Order, denominated from the Garter, have now admitted you their Friend, Brother, and Companion in faithful Testimony of which they impart and give you the Garter, which God grant that you deservingly receiving

---

seems to have overlooked conclusive evidence that Surrey did take an official part in the funeral ceremonies for Jane Seymour, he correctly points out that Nott (p. xliii) has misinterpreted this manuscript. On the chronological list the Earl of Surrey's name follows that of Sir Martin Bowes, who was not knighted until March, 1541.

<sup>16</sup> The Order of the Garter had been founded by Edward III in the first half of the fourteenth century as a royal college, or society, of knighthood. The college consisted of twenty-five Knights Companions and a Sovereign, who was the King of England. The seat of this college was the chapel of Windsor Castle, where in the choir were erected twenty-six elaborate stalls, thirteen on each side. Upon each stall was affixed a shield bearing the arms of the possessor, and over the stall were hung his banner, sword, and helmet. When a stall fell vacant by the death of the possessor, at the next Chapter of the Garter each Knight Companion was instructed to nominate nine candidates whom he deemed eligible to become Knight of the Garter. The lists of nominations were then submitted to the Sovereign, who often gave little or no heed to the nominations in naming the Order's unanimous election of the new member to fill the vacant stall.

<sup>17</sup> *Garter*, II, 421-423.

<sup>18</sup> Having no specific record of the presentation of the Garter to Surrey, I have drawn the following quotations from *Garter* as illustrative of the customary manner of such presentations.

it, may rightly wear and use to the Glory of God, the Honor of the most famous Order, and of your own.

So saying, he presented the Garter to Surrey and ordered him to tie it about his left leg to remind him in doing whatsoever he undertook to conduct himself "with Piety, Sincerity, Friendship, Faithfulness, and Dexterity." Having tied the Garter about his leg,

the Earl elect, setting himself to exert his eloquence to the utmost, in the most humble manner possible returned thanks to his most excellent Majesty, afterwards saluting also the whole Society as became him.

vi. The birthright of the scion of the Howards was being restored to him. Immediately after his election to the Order of the Garter, Surrey's training in the arts of war was renewed. He was ordered to accompany the Earl of Southampton and Lord Russell to Calais to see how the wars on the Continent were carried on. Southampton and Russell were the King's official agents, sent to the "Marches of Calais to set order there."<sup>19</sup> "My lord of Surrey and Sir Tho[ma]s Seamour . . . came only for their pastime [as] they have not brought in all over 24 persons with them."<sup>20</sup>

Surrey's "pastime," by his Majesty's will, was to see and to observe, to learn and to remember. Arriving at Calais on 5 May, Surrey was well received and treated with great respect. The defenses of the city were pointed out in detail as he was conducted about the walls. No bit of the system was overlooked, and the purpose of each part of the fortifications was explained. Surrey then continued to Guines, where he was equally well received, to study its fortifications in the same manner as he had studied the defenses of Calais.<sup>21</sup>

But Surrey's military lesson was brief. He could remain on the Continent only a short time because his presence was required at the Feast of St. George, held at Windsor on 22 May. On this date he was formally initiated into the Order of the

<sup>19</sup> Holinshed, IV, 1581; also notes 20 & 21 below. Bapst, p. 250, note 1, denies that Surrey went to Calais at this time, but the evidence that he did go is conclusive.

<sup>20</sup> *L. & P.*, XVI, 808.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, nos. 809, 811, 835.

Garter and given possession of his stall (the fifth on the Sovereign's side) in the Chapel of St. George.<sup>22</sup>

vii. Eight months previously, 8 September, 1540, the Earl of Surrey and his father had been appointed conjointly to the Stewardship of Cambridge University.<sup>23</sup> This appointment was not merely a grant of favor. It was also a recognition of their interest in learning and of Surrey's scholarly attainments.

Almost coincident with the appointment of Surrey and Norfolk to this office, funds were provided to establish at Cambridge University, and at Oxford University as well, Regius Professorships of Divinity, of Hebrew, of Greek, of Civil Law, and of Medicine. Court interest in such matters was an innovation. Before the time of Henry VIII the ruling class of England—the peers—were feudal lords trained in the art of war. They knew little else. Learning—and interest in learning—was confined to the clergy. Every student at the universities was, in a minor order at least, a professional churchman. Though a very few nobles had some slight knowledge of theology, literary works were almost unknown to them, as were philosophy, science, mathematics, and any sort of speculative thinking. The business of the peers was governing; their occupation was war; their recreation was hunting and mock fighting.

Henry VIII, however, had some scholarly training, an interest in education, and an excellent knowledge of controversial theology. The third Duke of Norfolk had received only a meager formal education, but his intelligence and his perspicacity made him a patron of the arts. That he provided Surrey with a tutor of John Clerke's training and wide literary interests is sufficient proof of his acceptance of the Revival of Learning which was emanating from Italy.

But the first English courtier of noble blood who took an interest in the Revival of Learning and possessed both the knowledge and the ability to contribute to the advancement of

<sup>22</sup> *Garter*, II, 423.

<sup>23</sup> "An Instrument for the Stewardship of the University of Cambridge, granted to Surrey conjointly with the Duke of Norfolk"; printed by Nott, app. 9, from "MSS. Bennet Coll. Camb."

English literature was the Earl of Surrey. Because of his high birth, his fame, his distinguished carriage, his courtly graces, his many accomplishments, he was the prototype of the new English courtiers. Although proof is necessarily lacking that those gifted and enthusiastic young men who began to throng the English Court were always conscious of emulating Surrey, it would seem that he was no slight influence in making education fashionable. He was interested in literature, the vernacular as well as the classic. Subsequent courtiers studied literature and the arts, and before long a knowledge of literature and some learning became a necessity at court. Surrey wrote sonnets and poetic love plaints after the manner of Petrarch, and for over fifty years copies of his poems circulated widely. During this time every courtier began to write polite verses praising the virtues of the unattainable mistress of his heart, and Sidney, in his *Defense of Poesie*, pointed out the merits of Surrey's poems and acknowledged his admiration of the man who wrote them.<sup>24</sup> Surrey's reputation and example must have played a greater part than is usually perceived or acknowledged in developing in sixteenth-century England the writing of love lyrics. Following his lead, the Elizabethans, with the vigor possessed only by a people who have recently been close to the soil, began the greatest outburst of lyric poetry in the literature of any language.

viii. Henry VIII was well pleased with his marriage to Catherine Howard. Her person was very agreeable to him. Her views and her connections enabled him to reverse his policy of the past few years—a policy which he had never liked personally, for Henry VIII was himself strictly orthodox in matters of Catholic faith. He was now able to come to an understanding with Charles V, to find relief from the danger of foreign affairs, and to prosecute his imperialistic designs on Scotland. The Howards and their conservative followers were also well pleased.

<sup>24</sup> The many parallels in the lives, conduct, and attitudes of Surrey and Sidney suggest the conjecture that Sidney may, to some extent at least, have been attempting to emulate Surrey—or better, to emulate the conception which tradition was already presenting of the first of the “new” English courtiers.

The Duke of Norfolk became, and remained until the last months of Henry's reign, the chief administrator of the royal secular policy. The royal will in ecclesiastical matters was expressed by another conservative, Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. The policy of Henry VIII henceforth until his death was:

in foreign affairs, a close adherence to the Emperor, partly because it was almost universally held to be the safest course for England to pursue, and partly because it gave Henry a free hand for the development of his imperialist designs on Scotland. In domestic affairs the predominant note was the extreme rigour with which the King's secular autocracy, his supremacy over the Church and the Church's orthodox doctrine were imposed upon his subjects.<sup>25</sup>

Unfortunately for the aging Henry's egoism, his happy relationship with Catherine Howard did not endure. On All Saint's Day, 1541, he had directed his confessor, the Bishop of Lincoln, to give thanks for his good life with Catherine Howard,<sup>26</sup> but before another day had passed Cranmer presented to him conclusive evidence of Catherine's misconduct before her marriage. Not wanting to believe the charge against Catherine of "dis-solute liuyng, before her mariage, with Fraunces Diram [Francis Dereham], and that was not secretely, but many knewe it,"<sup>27</sup> Henry ordered a thorough investigation. To his chagrin, evidence of his Queen's adultery was added to the charges against her:

Sithe her Mariage [to the King] she was vehemently suspected with Thomas Culpeper, whiche was brought to her Chamber at Lyncolne, in August laste, in the Progresse tyme, by the Lady of Rocheforde, and were there together alone, from a leuen of the Clocke at Nighte till foure of the Clocke in the Mornyng, and to hym she gaue a Chayne and a riche Cap.<sup>28</sup>

Thomas Culpepper and Francis Dereham confessed their sinful relations with Catherine Howard and were put to death at Tyburn on 10 December.

<sup>25</sup> A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, pp. 399-400.

<sup>27</sup> Hall, p. 842.

<sup>26</sup> *L. & P.*, XVI, 1334.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

The twentie and two daie of the same monethe were arreigned at Westminster: the Lorde Wylliam Hawarde and his wife, whiche lorde Wylliam was Vncle to the Quene; Katheryne Tilney, whiche was of counsaill of her hauing to dooe with Diram [Dereham]; Elizabeth Tilney; . . . and seruantes to the olde Duches of Norfolke . . . all indited of misprision for counsailing the euill demeanor of the Quene, to the slaunder of the Kyng and his succession: all thei confessed it and had Iudgement to perpetuall prison, and to lose their goodes, and the proffite of their lādes duryng their lifes: howbeit shortely after, diuerse of them wer deliuered by the kynges Pardon.<sup>29</sup>

An act attainting Queen Catherine Howard was passed by Parliament and received the royal assent by commission on 11 February, 1542. On the tenth, Catherine had been removed to the Tower, and three days later she was executed on Tower Green, where her cousin Anne Boleyn, accused of similar crimes, had lost her head.

Although other Howards lost lands and freedom because of the attainder of Queen Catherine Howard, her downfall was only a slight impediment to the Duke of Norfolk and his son. Marillac wrote to Francis I, 7 December, 1541:

L'on a prins garde, Sire, à une aultre close assez estrange, c'est que le duc de Norfolk non seulement s'est trové an jugement de ce qui concerne le deshonneur de son sang, mais aussi la pluspart du temps, examinant ces prisonniers, ne se gardoit de rire comme s'il eust eu cause de s'en resjouyr. Son filz le conte de Suré pareillement y assistoit et les frères de ladite dame royne et de Colpepre se promenoient à cheval par la ville. Telle est la coustume de ce pays, Sire, qu'il convient ceulx de mesme sang se maintenir ainsi et faire force à nature pour donner a congnoistre qu'ilz ne participent aux délictz de leurs parens et d'autant plus son fidelles au roy leur souverain.<sup>30</sup>

Additional evidence that Henry VIII did not remove his favor from Norfolk and his son are two grants to Surrey. In December, 1541, Surrey was granted "in tail, of the late college or

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* The Dowager Duchess of Norfolk and her daughters lost their lands and were sent into perpetual seclusion in the country. Lord William Howard was sent to the Tower, from which he was released before the end of the year.

<sup>30</sup> Kaulek, p. 371.

house of St. John, Rusworth, Norf[olk]."<sup>31</sup> The following May the King granted him patents to be a Commissioner of the Peace in Norfolk.<sup>32</sup>

Because of the necessity of advertising to the world his own innocence after the trial and conviction of his cousin Catherine, Surrey remained at court long enough to attend the execution on Tower Green.<sup>33</sup> Then, deeming it unwise to be too conspicuous at this time, both Surrey and his father probably retired to the country.

ix. With the coming of summer Surrey returned to court. On 13 July, 1542, the Privy Council sent an order to the "Warden off the Fleete [prison] for to receyve therle off Surrey, [who was] to remayne there prisoner during the Kinges plesor."<sup>34</sup> The Warden was further ordered to permit Surrey to have two of his servants to attend upon him, but to suffer none to resort to banquet with him—it being the common practice of nobles when in confinement to pass the time by entertaining their friends.

Surrey was imprisoned for having issued a challenge to one John à Leigh. As the records of these proceedings give no indication of the cause of this quarrel, several conjectural explanations have been offered.<sup>35</sup> That of Bapst<sup>36</sup> seems the most plausible. At about this time Leigh had been charged with treasonable association with Cardinal Pole.<sup>37</sup> Bapst suggests, though admitting Surrey's name nowhere appears in the records, that Leigh in clearing himself of the charge may have attempted to arouse suspicion of the Howards, whom he knew were Catholic in sympathy. If this were the cause, possibly Surrey was using again the method by which, we conjecture, he had successfully refuted previous accusations of treasonable

<sup>31</sup> *L. & P.*, XVI, 1488 (18).

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, XVII, 362 (66).

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>34</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, I, 17.

<sup>35</sup> The most ridiculous of these is Nott, p. 1, where the suggestion is made, without the slightest evidence, that this quarrel was caused by Leigh's slighting remarks to Surrey relating to the Faïre Geraldine. If proof were forthcoming that the John à Leigh were actually John Leigh of Stockwell, the half-brother of Queen Catherine, the suggestion in Brenan & Statham, p. 353, might be taken more seriously.

<sup>36</sup> P. 257 ff.

<sup>37</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Cleopatra E. VI, fol. 394; *S. P.*, *Henry VIII*, I, ii, 134 &

sympathies. But he did not tempt Fate a second time; he did not issue his challenge by striking his enemy in the precincts of the Court.

For whatever cause Surrey issued his challenge to Leigh, the significance of the incident to us lies chiefly in Surrey's petition to the Privy Council, which demonstrates that before the King<sup>38</sup> who had been crowned with Parliament's sanction Surrey could put an humble disposition on. From the Fleet Prison on 25 July, 1542, he wrote:

To the Lords of the Council.

My Very Good Lords: After my humble commendations to your Lordships; these presents shall be to advertise you, that albeit I have of late severally required each of you, by my servant Pickering, of your favour (from whom as yet I have received no other comfort than my passed folly hath deserved), I have yet thought it my duty again, as well to renew my suit as humbly to require you rather to impute this error to the fury of reckless youth, than to a will not conformable and contented with the quiet learning of the just reward of my folly; for as much as I did so suddenly and quickly procure and attempt to seek for friendship and entreat for my deliverance; as then not sufficiently pondering or debating with myself that a prince offended hath none redress upon his subject but condign punishment, without respect of person (although, for lack of strength, it yield not itself wholly to his gentle chastisement), whilst the heart is resolved in patience to pass over the same, in satisfaction of mine errors.

And, my Lords, if it were lawful to persuade by the precedent of other young men reconciled, I would affirm that this might sound to me a happy fault: by so gentle a warning to learn how to bridle my heady will: which in youth is rarely attained without adversity. Where, might I without vaunt lay before you the quiet conversation of my passed life; which (unstained with any dishonest touch, unseeming in such a man as it hath pleased God and the King to make me) might perfectly promise new amendment of mine offence. Whereof, if you doubt in any point, I shall humbly desire you, that during mine affliction (in which time malice is most ready to slander the innocent), there may be made

<sup>38</sup> The Privy Council derived its authority solely from His Majesty and acted solely in His Person; cf. A. F. Pollard, *Hist. of Eng., 1547-1603* (second impression, London, 1911), pp. 4-7.



an whole examination of my life: wishing, for the better trial thereof, to have the time of my durance redoubled; and so (declared as well tried, and unsuspected) by your mediations to be restored to the King's favour; than condemned in your grave heads [and] without answer or further examination to be quickly delivered (this heinous offence always unexcused, whereupon I was committed to this noisome prison, whose pestilent airs are not unlike to bring some alteration of health).

Wherefore, if your good Lordships judge me not a member rather to be clean cut away, than reformed; it may please you to be suitors to the King's Majesty on my behalf, as well as for his favour, as for my liberty; or else, at the least, if his pleasure be to punish this oversight with the forbearing his presence (which unto every loving subject, specially unto me, from a Prince cannot be less counted than a living death), yet it would please him to command me into the country, to some place of open air, with like restraint of liberty, there to abide his Grace's pleasure.<sup>39</sup>

Finally, albeit no part of this my trespass in any way to do me good, I should judge me happy if it should please the King's Majesty to think, that this simple body rashly adventured in the revenge of his own quarrel, shall be without respect always ready to be employed in his service; trusting once so to redouble this error, which may be well repe[n]ted but not revoked. Desiring your good Lordships that like as my offence hath not been, my submission may likewise appear; which is all the recompense that I may well think my doings answer not. Your grave heads should yet consider that neither am I the first young man that hath enterprised such things as he hath afterwards repented.

(signed) H. Surrey.<sup>40</sup>

Upon receipt of this letter the Privy Council immediately granted his petition. Following the dictate of the Royal Will, the Council was lenient to the scion of the Howards. Perhaps the imminence of war with Scotland was conducive to such prompt action. On 29 July the Warden of the Fleet was ordered to bring Surrey to the Court on the following Saturday. On 1 August he was removed from the Fleet, brought before the

<sup>39</sup> May this not be an echo of Surrey's confinement at Windsor?

<sup>40</sup> As printed in Brenan & Statham, pp. 354-356, from "original MS., Privy Council Books"; can be cf. Nott, p. 167 ff., where the same letter is printed from B.M., Harleian MS. No. 78, though the source is mistakenly given as "Harleian MS. No. 283."

Privy Council at Windsor, and freed on a bond of 10,000 marks.

The condition off this recognisance is suche as iff thabovebownden Erle off Surrey do neyther by himself, his servantes, or any other at his procurement, any bodily displesor ether by word or dede to Jhon a Legh, esquier, or to any of his, than, etc.<sup>41</sup>

Being free again, Surrey hastened to Newcastle-on-Tyne to join his father. The Duke of Norfolk was making preparation for the gatherings of troops for use against Scotland.

x. Much to Henry VIII's joy, the friendly relations between France and Spain at last broke down in 1542. The defeats which Charles had suffered at the hands of the Turks during the autumn and winter of 1541-1542 gave Francis hope that he too might defeat him. Also, Charles refused to give up Milan, the apple of Francis's eye for years. In January, 1542, Francis had captured Marano by stealth. He immediately began to offer bribes to Henry VIII to get his help in a war against the Emperor. Charles was also making open bids for Henry's support. By August, 1542, open warfare between Francis and Charles was under way.

Scotland at this time was much under the influence of the French. As Henry VIII could not be led to join France, France encouraged the Scots to attack England. Border skirmishes between the English and the Scots were the immediate result. A renewal of the war between England and Scotland was inevitable, and Henry VIII took the initiative. The war on the Continent freed Henry from the fear that France and Spain might unite against him. It also made certain that France would not send assistance to Scotland. About the first of September, 1542, the two lords of Douglas were banished from Scotland. One of these was Henry VIII's brother-in-law. Both had been friendly to England. Their banishment and the increasing number of Scottish raiding expeditions across the English Border gave Henry VIII an excuse to declare war. Henry was seeking possession of Scotland, although he main-

<sup>41</sup> *Acts of P.C.*, I, 19.

tained in his declaration of war that his purpose was to stop raiding on the Border, not to extend his territory.

This renewal of open hostilities with Scotland enabled Surrey to continue his military education. He was a Howard; therefore he was expected to have great military ability. As Henry VIII had uses for able military leaders, he forwarded Surrey's training. In August the Duke of Norfolk had been ordered to begin to gather troops. Henry VIII freed Surrey from prison so that he could join his father in this work.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Bapst, p. 370 ff., conjectures that at this time Surrey was infatuated with Anne Stanhope, wife of Sir Edward Seymour, then Earl of Hertford. By interpreting "Eche beast can chose hys fere" (Arber, p. 218) and lines of various other of Surrey's poems as specifically autobiographical, Bapst reconstructs "une scène qui se passa entre lui et elle au mois d'août 1542. Surrey, d'après ce que nous concluons des données peu précises qui nous sont parvenues, avait sollicité son père de donner à Lambeth un bal où serait invitée la comtesse de Aford; le duc de Norfolk accéda à ce désir, peut-être dans l'espoir que cette attention aiderait à la réconciliation de son fils avec les Seymours, ce qui eût été un résultat précieux à ce moment où Henry VIII, encore ému de infidélités de sa plus récente épouse Catherine Howard, était disposé à écouter toutes les insinuations lancées contre la famille de celle-ci. Malheureusement l'issue de la fête ne fut pas telle que la souhaitait le duc de Norfolk. La comtesse de Hertford se rendit bien au bal à Lambeth; mais Surrey s'étant approché d'elle et l'ayant engagée à danser, elle se détourna avec dédain, en disant qu'il avait vraiment trop de présomption à demander une faveur à l'épouse de l'homme dont il était l'ennemi acharné. Surrey riposta à cette sortie inattendue, et la fête qui devait amener une réconciliation, se termina par un esclandre." In support of his reconstruction (which is summarized without comment by Padel-ford, p. 222) Bapst cites the title given to "Eche beast can chose" in the second edition of *Tottel's Miscellany* ("A song written by the earle of Surrey by [to?] a lady that refused to daunce with him") and Michael Drayton's associating the names of Surrey and "beauteous Stanhope" in *England's Heroical Epistles* ("Surrey to Geraldine," vv. 145-148). Now that the myth of Surrey's love for "the Faire Geraldine" is known to be fallacious, Drayton's references to Surrey's admiration for any lady have authority only to arouse doubt of their authenticity; and as is now acknowledged, the origin of the titles in *Tottel's Miscellany* is unknown—they would seem to have been devised by the editor, whoever he was. Even if Bapst has detected correctly specific allusions in "Eche beast can chose" to individual Howards, one can offer of the allegory various interpretations which are, to say the least, as plausible as his. For instance, the lion—male, virile, frank, loyal, noble if not royal—may be intended to symbolize the House of Howard, whose members as they "semed well to lead the race" were inevitably thrown into contact with the spurious beauty of the white "wolfe"—female, vain, capricious, ambitious, ignoble but essential to living—which symbolizes the "new men," led by the Seymours. If one wishes to be more specific, Surrey's father, the third Duke of Norfolk, in person took a leading part on Flodden Field, when "a Lion of the race, That with his pawes a crowned king deuoured"; moreover, the third Duke also "was author of the game" of uniting the Howards and the Seymours by marriage (and Surrey

Lord William Howard was also released from the Tower to go to the war.<sup>43</sup> By October the Duke of Norfolk, accompanied by Surrey, Lord Thomas Howard, and Lord William Howard, was moving his troops north from York. On the twenty-first of the month Norfolk entered Scotland at the head of more than 20,000 men. Surrey's official position in this army is unknown, but at least he experienced a campaign which had all the aspects of a raiding expedition. The English forces, crossing the Tweed into Scottish territory at Berwick, met little organized opposition. Pillaging and burning as they went, the invaders laid waste the country. Kelsal was razed to the ground. In his epitaph on Thomas Clere, Surrey mentioned watching it burn.

Norfolk and his forces remained in Scottish territory but nine days and penetrated only to Kelso. The commissariat was unable to provide the necessary provisions. Even the supply of beer was insufficient. "It were pity the enterprise should fail for lack of that one thing,"<sup>44</sup> but the English were forced to withdraw.

A large Scottish force under Lord Maxwell, Warden on the Scotch West Marches, followed the English to the Border but would not risk an engagement. While the English returned to Berwick, James V gathered 10,000 men at Lockmaben. These were ordered to enter England by the shores of Solway in hope of taking Norfolk in the flank. The Duke, the English Lord Warden and Commander-in-Chief beyond Trent, had foreseen such an attempt and dispatched Sir Thomas Wharton, Warden of the Western Marches, to keep watch at this point and to send him word of all movements of Scottish troops.

The Scottish leader, Lord Maxwell, had been deposed in favor of James V's friend, Oliver Sinclair, when the Scots crossed the Esk to invade England on the night of 24 November. His leadership was not adequate and his forces were poorly organized. Wharton sent word of the invasion to Norfolk and

---

in 1542 was certainly not "still seking for a make"). But enough! Such conjecturing can have only the doubtful merit of emphasizing the ridiculousness of attempting, without convincing external evidence, to read into sixteenth-century verses the "True Confessions" of the writer.

<sup>43</sup> Kaulek, p. 458.

<sup>44</sup> *L. & P.*, XVII, 771.

moved with only five hundred men to engage the Scots until reinforcements could arrive. This small force was so well equipped that the Scots, taking it to be a vanguard of Norfolk's forces moving against them, were thrown into a sudden panic. In trying to retreat over the Esk, which was then in flood, many of them were drowned. Although Sinclair tried to rally his forces, he was unsuccessful and the Scots rushed headlong into Solway Moss, where they were at the mercy of the handful of English troops, who showed no leniency. All the Scots who were not taken prisoner were killed before the Duke of Norfolk had had time to move his main force against them. James V was in poor health and the humiliation of such a complete annihilation of his forces probably hastened his death, which occurred a fortnight later. The Howards had again annihilated the Scottish military strength.

xi. In the meantime, the sudden death of Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Elder, on 11 October, 1542, had called forth a number of elegiac verses. Among the best of these was "W[yat] resteth here, that quick could neuer rest,"<sup>45</sup> one of the few poems by Surrey which can be dated with certainty and the only poem by him which we know to have been printed during his lifetime.<sup>46</sup> From internal evidence in this poem and two others<sup>47</sup> in which Surrey pays tribute to Wyatt, most critics have concluded that the two poets were friendly acquaintances, if not warm friends. Such inferences are difficult to support. There is no external proof that they knew each other personally.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Arber, p. 29.

<sup>46</sup> Printed in *An excellent Epitaffe of syr Thomas Wyat, with two other compendious dyttyes, wherein are touchyd, and set furth the state of mannes lyfe*. [Colophon] Im-  
prynted at London by Iohn Herforde for Roberte Toye. [1542]; *S. T. C.*, 26054.

<sup>47</sup> The two sonnets which begin "In the rude age" (Arber, p. 218) and "Dyuers thy death" (Arber, p. 28).

<sup>48</sup> Nott, in his "Memoirs of Sir Thomas Wyatt" (*The Works of Surrey and Wyatt*, II, p. lxxxv) states, "The connection . . . that reflected most honour upon Wyatt's name was his friendship with Surrey; and yet, such is the perversity of time, which preserves the memory of many a trifle while things of moment perish in oblivion, nothing is recorded that enables us to say when that friendship began, or how it was matured." Nevertheless, although he also derides some of the traditions associating their names, he accepts as fact that they were personal friends, without citing his authorities. Nor can I find authority for the statement of Padel-

Moreover, a comparison of their lives shows that they had few opportunities to meet. And certainly they were political antagonists and strong adherents of actively hostile religious sects.<sup>49</sup> In his three poems Surrey may possibly have been acknowledging a sincere admiration for the man whose poetic achievements he knew, but in my opinion they are merely conventional expressions of sorrow—any one of which might well have been written at the death of any prominent man by a poet having only a slight knowledge of his subject.<sup>50</sup>

xii. The Duke of Norfolk remained as leader of the English forces in the north until the beginning of open hostilities against France in 1544. Surrey, however, returned south. Probably he returned as one of the company which brought the Scottish prisoners of Solway Moss to court, whither they were conducted to swear fealty to the English crown.

Almost immediately after Surrey's arrival in London a group of convivial companions began a series of rendezvous at the house of Mistress Arundell in St. Lawrence Lane. Mad pranks and "rags" were, and are, considered to be the inevitable folly of youths suddenly freed from the restrictions of academic life

---

ford, pp. 226-227, "But the malicious attack of Bonner upon Wyatt after the fall of Cromwell evidently aroused the ire of Surrey, for he and his sister induced the new queen, Catherine Howard, to use her influence with the king in securing the release of the poet from the Tower. For the remaining two years of Wyatt's life there may well have existed a hearty friendship between the two poets." Miss A. K. Foxwell's interesting conjectures concerning the history of the Devonshire MS. (*A Study of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poems* (London, 1911) p. 125 ff. and *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (London, 1913), II, 241 ff.) throw no light on their personal relationship. Except for John Leland's dedicating to Surrey his *Naeniae in mortem Thomae Viati* (London, 1542), which fact has little weight as evidence that the two poets were personally acquainted (cf. J. M. Berdan, *Early Tudor Poetry* (New York, 1920), pp. 519-520), the habit of mentioning together the names of the two poets seems to have followed the publication of *Tottel's Miscellany*. (Surrey's name is not mentioned in Bale's *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae* before the edition of 1559.)

<sup>49</sup> See below, p. 224.

<sup>50</sup> The interpretation of John M. Berdan concurs with mine only in part; in *Early Tudor Poetry* pp. 518-519, he writes, "The two Elizabethan sonnets are conventional; [but] the allusions in this piece ['Wyat resteth here'] show that the poet knew his subject, although the frigidity of the treatment suggests that this knowledge was of the head rather than of the heart."

or the restraints of military discipline. The young men who gathered privately in St. Lawrence Lane had just returned from the wars. Compared with the customary outbreaks under such circumstances, they were remarkably temperate. In the house of Mistress Arundell they amused themselves merrily. Much eating and drinking was done, although women played no part in their entertainment. Their chief diversion seems to have been to sally forth in high spirits to plague the citizens. At least twice they used stone bows—crossbows with stones for missiles—to torment the inhabitants of the district who exposed themselves in the streets. When no more human targets presented, they turned to shooting at windows and acting in general as young men who are without viciousness have always acted when foolishly disporting themselves. The mystifying factor in this matter is the evident reluctance of the Privy Council to take action. The Earl of Hertford, Surrey's enemy, was the leading spirit of the Privy Council at the time. As the Duke of Norfolk had recently supplanted him in the north, he had an additional grudge against the Howards. Nevertheless, in spite of the overwhelming evidence of acts of violence by the aristocratic young rowdies, and even of implications of treasonable assumptions relating to Surrey, the Privy Council delayed to act.

On 24 January, 1543,

a maid servant of . . . [Mistress] Arundell in St. Lawrence Lane came to complain that Castell [butcher in St. Nicholas Shalmelles in London] had deceived her with a knuckle of veal and desired in future to have the best for "peers of the realm should thereof eat and besides that a prince." Asked, "What Prince?" She answered, "The Earl of Surrey." Said, "He was no prince, but a man of honor, and of more honor like to be." To which she said, "Yes, and if oughts other than good should become of the King he is like to be king." Answered, "It is not so," and she said, "It is said so."<sup>81</sup>

During this examination it came to light that "certain gentlemen which were in her master's house were out after 9 P.M. 'and had stone bows with them,' and it was after 2 A.M. ere

<sup>81</sup> *L. & P.*, XVIII, i, 73 (1).

they came in again.”<sup>52</sup> This was described as having taken place on 19 January, but the Privy Council’s examination of this matter dragged on for over two months. Meanwhile, Surrey’s favorable relations with the King did not undergo any immediate change. On 13 February licence was granted to Surrey “to alienate the manor of Larlyngforth.”<sup>53</sup>

Not until 28 March was Millicent Arundell examined by the Privy Council. The record of this is:

My lord of Surrey, Sir John Clere, Thos. Clere (Surrey’s servant), young Peking, Hussey (treasurer to my lord of Norfolk), Davy Semer, and she had eaten flesh in her house last lenten season (in margin, “Item, Thomas Wyndam”). Her husband and young Wiat, Clere, and Piking have also eaten flesh on Fridays and fast days; but her husband only ate it in Lent. About Candlemas last, my lord of Surrey, Thos. Clere, young Wiat, Shelley (my lord of Surrey’s servant), and young Pickering, with their servants, went out of her house about 9 p.m. with four stone bows, and tarried forth till after midnight. Next day was great clamour of the breaking of glass windows, both of houses and churches, and shooting of men in the streets, and the voice was that those hurts were done by my Lord and his company; so she commanded her household to say nothing of the going out, and when her neighbours asked her she denied it. She heard Surrey “the night after, when Mr. Blage rebuked him for it, say that he had liever than all the good in the world it were undone, for he was sure it would come before the King and his Council; but we shall have a maddening time in our youth and therefore I am very sorry for it.” (Has heard “that Birche had most harm done with these stone bows, also Sir Richard Gressam’s windows” [this cancelled].) “That night, or the night before they used the same, rowing on the Thamys, and Thomas Clere told her how they shot at the [Queanes] at the Bank.”<sup>54</sup>

Other evidence makes it possible to conjecture a more detailed account of this episode.<sup>55</sup> On the evening of 19 January, Surrey and his companions had eaten well and imbibed freely. Becoming surfeited with the confinement of the house, they sallied into St. Lawrence (Jewry) Lane and so to Cheapside.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, (3).

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 226 (50).

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 327.

<sup>55</sup> I follow the reconstruction of Brennan & Statham, p. 367 ff.



With them they carried four "stone bows" and their servants, armed with cudgels, followed.

The London 'prentice has ever been known for his truculence. In Tudor times especially, he was no respecter of the rank or arms of the persons who happened to arouse his antagonism. And young gallants on a spree have always been fair game when they go slumming. The free-for-all fight first broke out in Cheapside. The citizens and 'prentices were routed by the stone bows. The victors, shouting and singing, gave chase. Turning up Milk Street, they had reached the house of Sir Richard Gresham when the last of their victims disappeared.

The glass windows of this "new man," a rich profiteer in the suppression of the monasteries, caught the eye of these crossbowmen who had no more human targets. To roistering young Englishmen the sound of shattering glass is yet, apparently, a necessary adjunct to a "jolly party." What could be more apropos than that the glass of this Protestant profiteer should furnish the obligato to the shouts of Surrey and his companions! The cross bows were turned upon Gresham's windows to begin the accompaniment which was finished by the window glass of Alderman Birch, nearby.

Tiring of their inanimate targets, these roisterers went in search of new fields to conquer. Arriving at the river, then the "High Street" of London, they took boat, probably at Queenhythe or Paul's Wharf, without having a destination. Once embarked they decided that they must be rowed up and down along the Bank, or Bankside (as the south shore of the Thames is termed). They may have stopped at a tavern or so to add fuel to their enthusiasm, but their chief amusement on the river was to shoot pellets and hurl witty comments at the "queanes" and "bullies" who infested the Bank at night. So hilarious were they that the cold winds of the river in January did not drive them back to St. Lawrence Lane and the walls of Mistress Arundell until after 2 A.M.

A Privy Council record of further examination of witnesses in this matter reveals the interest of some member of the Privy Council in gathering evidence with which to charge Surrey with treason.

At Westminster, 2 Apr. [1543], Mylicent Arundel confesses that once when my lord of Surrey was displeased about buying of cloth she told her maids in the kitchen how he fumed, and added, "I marvel they will thus mock a prince." "Why," quoth Alys, her maid, "is he a prince?" "Yea, Mary, is he," quoth this deponent, "and if aught should come at the King but good, his father should stand for King [be Regent to Prince Edward]." Upon further examination she can not recollect speaking the last words "and if aught, etc."

Joan Whetnall confesses that talking with her fellows touching my lord of Surrey's bed she said the arms were very like the King's, and she thought that "if aught came at the King and my lord Prince [Edward], he would be king after his father." Both these persons and Alice deny that they ever heard any other person speak of such matters.<sup>56</sup>

#### On 1 April

Th'erle of Surrey, being sent for t'appere before the Counsell, was charged by the sayde presence, as well off eating off flesshe, as of a lewde and unsemely manner of walking in the night abowght the stretes and breaking wyth stone bowes off certayne wyndowes. And touching the eating of flesshe he alleged a license, albeitt he hadde nott so secretly used the same as apperteyned. And towching the stone bowes, he cowlde nott denye butt he hadde verye evyll done therein, submitting himselff therefore to suche ponishment as sholde to them be thowght good. Whereapon he was committed to the Fleete.

... April 2, Wiatt and young Pickering [were] examined again and continued to deny [all charges] until Clere confessed before them and then all admitted. Wiatt and Pickering were [committed] to [the] Tower.<sup>57</sup>

What happened to the companions of Surrey, Wyatt, and Pickering has not come to light.

Bapst believes that the Privy Council did not wish to act even in the face of the evidence which their examinations produced, that only because the Earl of Hertford insisted Surrey must be punished did they order him into confinement.<sup>58</sup> He cites a manuscript in the British Museum<sup>59</sup> to support his

<sup>56</sup> *L. & P.*, XVIII, i, 351.

<sup>57</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, I, 104.

<sup>58</sup> Bapst, p. 268 ff.

<sup>59</sup> Additional (Sloane) MS. no. 1523, fol. 36<sup>v</sup> & 37.

statement. This manuscript contains "Maxims of Great Men of the Temporality of Henry VIII and Elizabeth" which apparently have no direct reference, as Bapst seems to infer that they do. To permit the reader to judge for himself, the following "maxims" attributed in the manuscript to the Seymours are quoted in the order in which they are recorded:

Princes are too reserved to be taken with ye very first appearances of worth, unless recomended by tryed judgm<sup>ts</sup>. It's fitt, as well as comon, y<sup>t</sup> yey have their counsellors for p<sup>er</sup>sons as well as things.

The Earle of Surry and other nobility were imprisoned for eating flesh in Lent.

A secreat & unobserved contempt of ye law is a close undermining of authority; w<sup>ch</sup> must be either its selfe in indulging nothing, or be nothing in allowing all.

Liberty knows no restraint, no limit, when winked at.

In Counsellis stability: things will have their first or second agitation: if yey be not tossed upon ye argum<sup>t</sup> of Councell, yey will be tossed upon ye waves of fortune.

If these "maxims" can be taken as a unit, they seem to support Bapst's inference, but the manner in which they are inscribed in the manuscript neither justifies nor prohibits this assumption.

viii. Surrey had acknowledged his fault and admitted that he deserved whatever punishment the Privy Council deemed suitable for roistering in the streets. He could do no less. Upon being imprisoned, however, he wrote his *Satire on London*<sup>60</sup> in the same spirit of deviltry that he had gone forth into the streets at night seeking diversion. As Nott wished to think Surrey a Protestant, he attempted to read the expression of Protestant religious prejudices into this poem by Surrey.<sup>61</sup> but such a critical inference is not justified. The poem is merely an amusing satire. The writer, his tongue in his cheek, is making an ironical excuse for his waywardness. The result is a poem which should remove all doubt that Surrey had a sense of

<sup>60</sup> Padelford, p. 85.

<sup>61</sup> Nott, p. liii & 362 ff.

humor and be accepted as strong evidence that he was not in any way related to Ralph Roister Doister.

xiv. The date at which Surrey was released from the Fleet is uncertain. He did not attend the Chapter of the Garter on 28 April, 1543,<sup>62</sup> and he was also exempt "from attending the Feast of that Order to be held at Windsor Castle 6 May next."<sup>63</sup> On 27 May, however, he was one of the witnesses to a "notorial instrument witnessing the oath (recited) given by Henry VIII at Hampton Court."<sup>64</sup> Surrey must have been freed from the Fleet sometime between 26 April and 27 May,<sup>65</sup> for his being called upon to be a royal witness at the latter date assures us that he was free at this time and in the good graces of the King.

<sup>62</sup> *Garter*, II, 424-426.

<sup>63</sup> *L. & P.*, XVIII, i, 457.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 603.

<sup>65</sup> Wyatt and Pickering were released from the Tower on 3 May. Bapst, p. 273 thinks that Surrey would not have been confined longer than they. Brennan & Stat- ham, p. 379, states, "Surrey's name disappears from the Fleet books early in July, 1543." I have been unable to determine the source of this statement. If documents of the Fleet Prison of so early a date are in existence, they are entirely unknown to custodians of the public records.

## CHAPTER VI

### COMPLETING HIS MILITARY TRAINING

Surrey was given opportunity to add to his military training in 1543 by the agreeing of Henry VIII and Charles V to join forces in a war against France. Negotiations to this end had been undertaken in February, but several months passed before the two monarchs could come to terms. In May, however, a secret treaty between them was ratified.<sup>1</sup> Charles was to invade France early the next year, while Henry bound himself to assist the Emperor with a body of at least 10,000 men. On 22 June an English-Spanish joint intimation of war was given to the French Ambassador.

Seeking to benefit themselves at the expense of Francis, Henry and Charles were to join their military forces. But their objectives were not the same, and neither was interested in furthering the other's ends. Although Scotland's power had not been entirely overthrown, Solway Moss had greatly lessened her military strength. Henry VIII wanted to keep France from helping Scotland stave off the growing possibility of union with England. Charles wished to force Francis to give up his claim to Milan and to stop Francis from upholding the German princes in their resistance to Imperial demands.

Henry VIII's impending need of military leaders seems to have guided his treatment of the Howards throughout the year. This need may explain the mildness of the punishment which the Privy Council meted out to Surrey for his pranks in the streets of London. At the ceremony of Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine Parr on 12 July, Surrey was, however, assigned no official duties. A Tudor could not be too lenient. The greater part of the summer of 1543, therefore, Surrey spent in the country, at Framlingham and at Norwich. Although he visited the Court at intervals, he probably devoted

<sup>1</sup> Henry VIII's oath to this treaty was the "notorial instrument" which Surrey witnessed on 27 May; *L. & P.*, XVIII, i, 603.

most of his time to completing the translation, which he had begun several years before, of Books II and IV of the *Aeneid*.<sup>2</sup>

By autumn Surrey was again very much in the royal favor. From Woodstock, near Oxford, on 1 October, Henry VIII wrote to Charles V commending "the earl of Surrey, knight of his Order [of the Garter], who desires to see the Emperor's camp; and whose request in this Henry has readily granted, hoping that by experience of war he may succeed to the honorable qualities of his relatives."<sup>3</sup>

An English military force, under the command of John Wallop, had been sent over during the summer of 1543 to aid the Emperor in his campaign in the north of France. The Emperor had undertaken to capture the town of Landrecy. Immediately after Henry VIII wrote commending Surrey to Charles V, the young Knight of the Garter set out for the Continent and joined the English troops before Landrecy on 4 October. Sir John Wallop, who had been taught the trade of war by the Duke of Norfolk, treated Surrey with every consideration, admitted him to the councils of war, outlined for him the general plan of the campaign, and explained to him the details of the siege. Surrey was always eager to see and to learn. According to the report of Surrey's arrival which Wallop sent to the King, Wallop himself conducted Surrey through the English trenches about Landrecy. During this visit to the front line Surrey was "somewhat saluted"<sup>4</sup> by the ordnance of the enemy; as he heedlessly exposed his person in his desire for a better view of the trenches and the defenses of the town, he narrowly escaped serious injury.

Another of Sir John Wallop's reports to the King is couched in words which seem to reflect some description by the poet:

The mortar that shoots artificial bullets . . . shot last night in the presence of the Duke of Arschot, my lord of Surrey, Mr. Carew, and others, "who say that it was a strange and dreadful sight to see the bullet fly into the air spouting fire on every side; and at his [its] fall they might well perceive how he [it] leaped from place

<sup>2</sup> This is merely conjecture; cf. above, pp. 65-67; Bapst, 234-236, 274 ff.; Brennan & Statham, p. 380 ff., Padelford, pp. 233-234.

<sup>3</sup> *L. & P.*, XVIII, ii, 243.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 266.

to place, casting out fire, and within a while after burst forth and shot off guns out of him a hundred shot, every one as loud to the hearing as a hacquebut à crocq; whereof they counted well four score; and what hurt it hath done, I know not yet."<sup>5</sup>

Having viewed the English works, Surrey then hastened to the Spanish lines. Here again, he was well received. To the Duke of Arschot and the Grand Master, Fernando de Gonzaga, "Surrey's coming was very agreeable . . . as declaring Henry VIII's friendship."<sup>6</sup> The Grand Master himself came to meet Surrey half way between the two camps. Upon reaching the Spanish lines, both the Duke of Arschot and the Grand Master acted as Surrey's guides and instructed him in the Spanish methods of warfare. Surrey was also presented to the Emperor, who was very gracious and declared himself to be very favorably impressed by the young man's person and conduct. On 21 October he wrote to Henry VIII:

Et quant a ce que Nous avez escript en recommandation du filz de notre cousin le Duc de Norphocq, pour lendresser es choses de la guerre, il a se bon exemple de voz gens, quil ne pourra faillir den estre instruit; et tous les nostres le respecteront comme merite la valeur du pere et le gentil cueur du filz, et Nous oblige vostre recommandation.<sup>7</sup>

Surrey remained near Landrecy until the English-Spanish forces went into winter quarters. While there he put his time to good use, losing no opportunity to see service and to acquire knowledge of methods of waging war. Sir John Wallop, in another of his official dispatches, asked the King's Secretary, Paget, to inform the Duke of Norfolk that

my Lord of Surrey hath lost no time since his arrival at the army; for he visiteth all things that be meet for a man of war to look upon for his learning: and such a siege hath not been seen this long time in these [parts], and things devised for the getting of a town as this is. And although they have been slow in doing the same, yet it groweth now to a right good perfection.<sup>8</sup>

Wallop's forecast of the success of the siege was wrong. Al-

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 266.

<sup>7</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII, IX, v, 920.*

<sup>8</sup> Nott, p. lvii; concerning the siege of Landrecy, see also his appx. X-XIV.

though some of the outworks were carried and the town set on fire by a battery of mortars,<sup>9</sup> Landrecy was not taken. While the English and Spanish were preparing to make a general assault word was brought that the French King was on the way with a large force to relieve the town. Winter was setting in swiftly and the roads were getting bad. Soon the movement of troops or supplies would be impossible. The Emperor called a general council of war of both Spanish and English leaders. Surrey attended.<sup>10</sup> It was decided to raise the siege, and on 9 November the English and Spanish armies separated, the Spanish going into winter quarters at Cambrai, the English troops retiring to Calais.

The Emperor had failed to take Landrecy, but the campaign did serve as an excellent training school for the English, both officers and men. As Wallop wrote to the King,

I promise your Majesty that in all the wars I have been in, I have not seen such another time for youth to learn as at our being present before Landrecy, especially sithens th' Emperor's coming; who brought with him horsemen and foot of all nations; so as your Majesty's men here might learn, and chose what fashion they liked best.<sup>11</sup>

ii. When the English and Spanish armies separated, Surrey took leave of the Emperor and his train. They had treated him almost as a prince of the royal blood. The leave taking was most ceremonious, with many compliments, protestations of esteem on both sides, and the forecast of meeting again the next summer. Shortly after Surrey left to return to England, Charles again wrote to Henry lauding the young man,

Treshault, Tresexcellent, et Trespuissant Prince, nostre treschier et tresame bon Frere et Cousin: Tant et si affectueusement que pouvons a Vous Nous recommandons. Retournant nostre cousin, le Conte de Sorey pardela, Nous serons releve de faire longue lettre pource quil Vous pourra dire les occurrans de ce coustel. Et

<sup>9</sup> Nott, p. lviii, calls attention to the lines in Surrey's tribute to Thomas Clere, Tracing whose steps thou sawest Kelsall blaze, Laundersey burnt, and battered Bullen render. (Padelford, p. 99)

<sup>10</sup> *L. & P.*, XVIII, ii, 337.

<sup>11</sup> Nott, p. lix.



seullement adjousterons, que il a baille bon tesmoingnage en larmee, de quil il est filz, et quil ne veult deffaillir densuyr le pere et ses predecesseurs, et avec si gentil cueur et telle dexterite, quil na este besoing de luy en riens apprendre, et que Vous ne luy commanderez riens, quil ne saiche bien executer.<sup>12</sup>

Such praise would seem, to an English ear, to be too high. But it must be remembered that it was written in French by a member of a race which has not the restraint of the English in expressing admiration. Moreover, as Professor Padelford observes:

Surrey's intellectual grace and refined address never failed to impress the French and Spanish. In this respect they were much better able to appreciate him than were his own countrymen, who lacked urbanity and the amenities of a cultivated society. He possessed what Englishmen of the day did not possess and could not understand, the qualities which the southern Europeans embrace in the term "the gentle heart."<sup>13</sup>

Surrey arrived in England in time to attend the Chapter of the Order of the Garter held at Hampton Court on Christmas Eve.<sup>14</sup> Soon afterwards he was created Cup Bearer to the King,<sup>15</sup> probably in recognition of such high praises of his conduct on the Continent.

iii. On 14 January, 1544, a bargain in land was concluded between the King and the Duke of Norfolk and his heir.<sup>16</sup> By this arrangement the Howards acquired St. Leonard's Hill near Norwich, Norfolk. The Duke immediately waived his claim to this land, giving Surrey a clear and complete title to it. Having changed the name of the hill to Mount Surrey, the Earl started to build upon it the beautiful home which was to be called Surrey House.

At last the Earl and Countess of Surrey were to have a residence of their own. As the war in France could not be renewed

<sup>12</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII, IX, v, 938.*

<sup>13</sup> Padelford, p. 25.

<sup>14</sup> *Garter, II, 427.*

<sup>15</sup> Bapst, p. 288, where the citation of his source is incorrect. Although the exact date is uncertain, *L. & P., XX, ii, appx. 2 (vi)*, proves that Surrey received the appointment some little time before July, 1545.

<sup>16</sup> *L. & P., XIX, i, 25.*

until summer, Surrey was free from military duties, and in their eagerness for a home of their own, the Earl and Countess immediately had plans drawn up for the building of a place of great beauty and, according to Nott, purely Grecian in style.<sup>17</sup> To secure the best of designs and workmanship, Surrey had probably taken into his service one or more of the Italian architects<sup>18</sup> then at the English Court and sent them to Norfolk to oversee the erection of the building, on which work was begun at once. Whenever Surrey's presence at court was not required, he doubtlessly hurried to Mount Surrey to look after and to push the construction of Surrey House<sup>19</sup> himself.

Court duties, however, filled a large part of Surrey's time during the winter of 1543-44. As many persons of rank from the Continent visited the English Court, Henry VIII had use for the young Howard whose person was so agreeable to Continentals. It seems that Surrey would have been appointed "The King's Welcomer" if such a post had existed.

One of the most notable visitors to England at this time was Don Juan Estaban Manrique de Lara, third Duke of Najera. He landed at Dover on 4 February. Although he came on no official business, he soon notified Henry VIII of his arrival and requested an audience. The King promptly sent Surrey "to visit and offer compliments on his part to the Duke."<sup>20</sup> The young English earl and the Spanish general were quite amiable, having met before at the Spanish camp before Landrecy. As Henry VIII was at Hampton Court when the Duke of Najera reached London, it fell to Surrey to conduct him about the town. The Spanish grandee was very much impressed by what he saw. His secretary, Pedro de Guato, who accompanied the Duke, recorded his impressions as follows:

<sup>17</sup> Nott, p. lxi.

<sup>18</sup> As Nott (p. lxi, note a) suggests, although the name of the architect has not been preserved, the foreigners whom Surrey was accused of liking too well to have about him (*L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 555 (8, 14); *S. P.*, *Henry VIII*, I, ii, 265) "were probably no other than Italian artists."

<sup>19</sup> Francis Blomefield, *Norfolk* (Fersfield, Norwich, & Lynn, 1739-75), II, 161 & 797, tells us that Surrey House was a sumptuous residence which was to some degree sacked, but not destroyed, during Kett's Rebellion in 1549.

<sup>20</sup> *Archaeologia*, XXIII (London, 1831), p. 351; also *L. & P.*, XIX, i, 296.

This city is one of the largest in Christendom, its extent being nearly a league. I did not see a house in London in which merchandise was not sold. . . . There are over two hundred and fifty parish churches. . . . The Tower of London is a very strong fortress. . . . We saw four lions, very large and fierce, and two leopards, confined within wooden railings. In another part of the city we saw seven bears, some of them of great size. They are led out every day into an inclosure [at Paris Garden on the Bankside, Southwark], where being tied with a long rope, large and intrepid dogs are thrown to them in order that they may bite and make them furious. It is not bad sport to see them fight, and the assaults they give each other. To each of the large bears are matched three or four dogs, which sometimes get the better, and sometimes are worsted, for besides the fierceness and great strength of the bears to defend themselves with their teeth, they hug the dogs with their paws so tightly that unless the masters come to assist them they would be strangled by such soft embraces. Into the same place they brought a pony with an ape fastened on its back, and to see the animal kicking amongst the dogs, with the screams of the ape, beholding the curs hanging from the ears and neck of the pony, is very laughable. A river runs through London, one of the largest I have ever seen. It is not possible, in my opinion, that a more beautiful river should exist in the world, for the city stands on each side of it, and innumerable boats, vessels, and other craft are seen moving on the stream. . . . The bridge on this river is the finest I ever beheld, or have heard of; nor do I believe its equal is to be found. It crosses from one part of the city to the other, which is divided by water. There are twenty wide arches, and the whole of the bridge (which is of great length) forms a beautiful street, with houses of tradesmen built on either side of it. Never did I see a river so thickly covered with swans as this.<sup>21</sup>

After the Duke of Najera had been in London several days, the English King returned to Westminster to give him an audience on 17 February. On that date Surrey and the Earl of Essex, brother of Queen Catherine Parr, "came to dine with the Duke and accompany him to the King." Immediately after the dinner the Duke, attended by "some Spanish gentlemen who were resident in London," was led by Surrey and

<sup>21</sup> *Archaeologia*, XXIII, 354 ff.

Essex to the palace. "They embarked on the river to avoid the distance of half a league from the Duke's lodging to the palace, and landed at one of the gates." At Westminster the Spanish general was presented to the King, who gave him gracious audience.<sup>22</sup>

Two days after his audience, the Duke of Najera took his departure. Surrey was free again. We may conjecture that he hastened to Norfolk, where the first steps in the construction of Surrey House were being undertaken. For almost two months he was able to give himself to the joyous task of beginning to raise an edifice which would honor the name bestowed upon it. In his enthusiasm, however, Surrey purposed too high, for living so much of his life in the palaces of kings had made his tastes too sumptuous for his purse. As has been pointed out before, the Duke of Norfolk was chary in furnishing his eldest son with money. When Surrey House was completed late in the year 1545 Surrey had used up all his money and almost all his credit in constructing the building. He had great difficulty in getting suitable furnishings for it. "As concernynge the provisions of the house . . . albeit the same will not be obtained at my Lord's [the Duke of Norfolk's] hand," Surrey's agent wrote to him October 26, 1545, "[consequently] we shall practise howe to comme by them by sitche schifte as may be maid upon my credite in thys towne [Norwich]."<sup>23</sup> But Surrey had set his heart upon having his home furnished to the last detail in the grand style befitting the house he had built—and having determined his course, he could not be turned from it by pestilence or high water. That Surrey, by some means, did have his home furnished in the sumptuous manner he wished it to be furnished in is shown clearly by the official lists of the contents of Surrey House which were drawn up when he was attainted and his possessions confiscated by the Crown.<sup>24</sup>

iv. In April, 1544, Surrey had to forsake his task in Norwich to return to court. His attendance was required at the Chapter

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 351 ff. is the source of all quotations in this paragraph.

<sup>23</sup> P.R.O., Domestic State Papers BB/81; printed in Bapst, p. 290.

<sup>24</sup> Nott, appx. XLVII.

of the Order of the Garter held each year on St. George's Day, and he was present at the chapter held at Greenwich at 3 P.M. on 23 April.<sup>25</sup> As a Knight of the Garter it was also necessary for him to attend the annual Feast of St. George, held that year at Windsor on 18 May.<sup>26</sup>

These annual duties discharged, Surrey was not able, however, to return to Norfolk. Henry VIII forced him to remain close at hand. In the military preparations for the coming summer campaign on the Continent, Surrey was assigned a number of goodly offices. About 27 May he was sent with a large retinue to meet the Duke of Albuquerque.<sup>27</sup> He welcomed this Spanish duke to London and presented him to the King, who showed marked favor to the young English earl as well as to his guest from Spain.

While he was at the Court during the spring of 1544 probably Surrey continued to study and to write poetry—as a diversion only, of course. He had a short time before taken into his household Thomas Churchyard.<sup>28</sup> What place Churchyard held there is not recorded, but as he always styled himself "Gentleman," he may have been a page waiting immediately upon Surrey's person. Not ten years of age when he came to live in Surrey's family, he received there, through his master's generosity and interest in learning, the liberal education which enabled him to call himself "court poet" in the reign of Elizabeth. His debt to Surrey, Churchyard acknowledged in his *Charge*, published in 1580, by the following tribute:

A maister of no meane estate, a mirrour in those daies,  
His happie Fortune then hym gate, whose virtues must I praise.

More heauenly were those gifts he had, then yearthly was his  
forme,

His corps too worthie for the graue, his fleshe no meate for worme.

An Erle of birthe; a God of sprite, a Tullie for his tong;  
Me thinke of right the worlde should shake, when half his praise  
were ronge.

Oh cursed are those crooked crafts, that his owne countrey  
wrought,

<sup>25</sup> *Garter*, II, 429.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 432.

<sup>27</sup> *L. & P.*, XIX, i, 591.

<sup>28</sup> Nott, p. lxii; Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (ed. 1813), I, 727.

To chop of sutche a chosen hed, as our tyme nere forthe brought.

His knowledge crept beyond the starrs, & raught to Joves hie  
trone,

The bowels of the yearth he sawe, in his deepe breast unknowne.

His witt lookt through eche mās deuice; his iudgemēt grouded  
was,

Almoste he had foresight to knowe, ere things should come to  
passe;

When thei should fall what should betied. Oh what a losse of  
weight,

Was it to lose so ripe a hedde, that reached sutche a height.

In eury art he feelyng had, with penne past Petrarcke sure,  
A fashon framde whiche could his foes to freendship oft alure,

His virtues could not kepe hym here, but rather wrought him  
harms,

And made his enemies murmure oft, & brought them in by swarms.

Whose practise put hym to his plunge, and loste his life thereby,  
Oh cancred brests that haue sutche harts, wherin suche hate doth  
lye.

As told I haue, this yong man seru'd, this maister twise twoo  
yere.

And learnd therein sutche fruitfull skill, as long he held full dere.

And usd the penne as he was taught, and other gifts also,  
Whiche made hym hold the cappon hed, where some do croch full  
lo.

In 1544 Surrey also became the patron of another and more scholarly man of letters. This was Hadrian Junius, one of the most eminent Dutch scholars of his day. During the siege of Landrecy, Junius became acquainted with Bishop Bonner, who offered him many inducements to come to England, but upon his arrival there, Bonner failed to provide the promised patronage. He was, however, introduced to the Duke of Norfolk, who received him into his family "in the quality of a Physician"<sup>29</sup> and towards the end of March, 1544, gave him lodgings at Lambeth, the Duke's house in London. Meeting Junius frequently there, Surrey came to admire the learning of this erudite scholar, and before the first of the August following he had begged his services from his father to make Junius the

<sup>29</sup> Nott, p. lxi, thinks Surrey first received him into the family, but see sources cited below, note 30.

tutor of his children.<sup>30</sup> Hadrian Junius justified his patron's opinion of him; for Surrey's children, both sons and daughters, later won many acknowledgments as patrons of learning and excellent scholars.

v. Henry VIII and Charles V had during the winter of 1543-44 formulated the continuance of their plans against France. They agreed—that is, each for the benefit of the other said that he agreed—to move directly on Paris and thus to destroy France as a political entity in Europe. Henry VIII was to move on Paris from Calais with 30,000 men. Count de Buren was to support him with 10,000 Germans. The Emperor with all the force he could command was to advance on Paris from the Netherlands through Champagne.<sup>31</sup>

The English army was ready to take the field much earlier in the summer than was usual during Henry VIII's reign. By 23 June, 1544, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Surrey, and others of the War Council commanding the vanguard of the English forces were writing reports to Henry VIII from the Continent.<sup>32</sup> Upon Surrey fell the duty of disposing the men whom Henry continued to send across the Channel. He had been made Marshall of the Field.<sup>33</sup> This was a great honor for so young a man. The duties of the Marshall of the Field, or the Lord Marshall, were of the utmost importance in a sixteenth-century army. As Francis Markham has described the office:

The Lord Marshall of an Army above all other Officers ought to be a most approved soldier; for howsoever in the greatness of other places in the wars, there may be a dispensation of skill (Countenance and Vertue being as requisite as knowledge and Judgement), yet in this office it may not be so, for this man above all others hath the greatest place of action and direction in all the Army; and howsoever he hath more to command than any, yet all they under

<sup>30</sup> Bapst, pp. 291-293; Hadrian Junius, *Epistolae* (Dordrecht, 1652?), pp. 89, 178, 203, 392.

<sup>31</sup> *Collection universelle des mémoires particuliers relatifs à l'histoire de France*, A. Perrin, editor (London, 1785-1806), XXI & XXII, which are *Mémoires de du Bellay & Mémoires de Monluc* and offer detailed descriptions of this campaign.

<sup>32</sup> *L. & P.*, XIX, i, 763.

<sup>33</sup> Archives of Norfolk House; Lord Herbert, p. 511.

him have no power to dispense or lessen the least duty belonging to the Marshall of the Field. For howsoever the General or Lieutenant-General may precede him in place, yet they ought not in knowledge, since both themselves and the whole Army, both Horse and Foot, are bound to move only by the Marshall's direction. And though to the General (who is his Commander) the Marshall may not say this or that you must do, yet he may say here in this place Your Honor ought to stand. Therefore, what manner of man this great person ought to be, for Wisdom, Temperance, Valor, and Vertue, everyone is better able to describe and judge than to find out a person suitable to the employment.

Next the General, the Lord Marshall hath the supreme command of the whole Field. Therefore his trumpet is first in the morning to discharge the Watch and his particular troop ought first of all to be mounted; for it is an honor which the Army alloweth him by reason of the infinite paines which he taketh in his own particular person. Neither shall his troop Watch or Ward, but are discharged of that duty by reason of their other more serious occasions. After he and his troop are mounted, he marcheth to the outmost borders of the Camp and there makes a stance till the whole Army be ranged; neither quits he his place till the last man be on foot. He is himself in all things both assistant and director to the General of the Horse and the Sergeant-Major. All the day long he is tied to no battalion, but at his own pleasure may bestow his own person, sometimes accompanying the General, sometimes leading his own troop, and indeed is always where the greatest occasion of necessity is and where the enemy is most likely to assail and adventure. As his place is most honorable, where honor is, there should be his residence. As his person, so his troop also is not tied to any especial or certain place, but may vary and alter as danger and honor shall give occasion, ever supplying whatsoever is weakest. As a prepared Champion, the Lord Marshall must continually be ready to entertain the enemy upon all his approaches; at night upon retreats, the rear is his place and he bringeth it up with courage and safety. Then being come to the Camp he stayeth till every man be dismounteth; he taketh order for the Scouts; he adviseth with the Sergeant-Major for the Guards; he vieweth the strengths of the Camp; and he seeth there be no decay in the ditches or entrenchments.

The Lord Marshall is the supreme and only powerful Judge in all causes of Life and Death, in criminal offences and controversies of



all manner of natures; he provideth for the due execution of all the Laws, Bands, Articles, and Institutions which shall be appointed by the General to be observed; and he seeth due punishment executed for any breach of the same. Whence it proceeds that he ought to be exceeding well read and learned in all martial Laws, the customs of Countries, the degrees of Honor and the distributions of Bloods, Places, and Employments. That he may the better proceed in these affairs, he is to be assisted with divers learned and experienced officers under him: as the Judge-Marshall and the Provost-Marshall [and a host of others], and twenty or thirty Gentlemen for a continual guard about his person. . . .

It is the Office of the Lord Marshall to give order to the Master of the Ordnance, both for his march and for his passage, both where, when, and which way all his provisions shall go for the best advantage and safety. And at the planting of Artillery or making of Batteries, the Lord Marshall is to oversee the proceeding and to give directions upon any doubt or misadventure. He is to give order unto the Victual-Master, Wagon-Master, and all Officers of their natures, both for their lodgments, stores, and all other necessary accommodations. Against all violences or injuries which shall be offered them, he is to see a careful and speedy reformation.

When the Army is to be encamped in any new place, the Sergeant-Major-General, the Quarter-Master-General, the Sergeant-Majors of Regiments, the Scout-Master, and all inferior Quarter-Masters (with sufficient guard of the best Horsemen) are to attend the Lord Marshall, and he, out of his own power with the modest advise of them, shall assign the place wherein the Camp shall be pitched and the manner, form, and proportion it shall carry, the bounds it shall contain, and the distinction of every place and commodity, advantage, strength, or discommodity which it shall please him to annex unto the same. And according to the Lord Marshall's pleasure, so shall the Quarter-Master-General see it devised.

It is in the power of the Lord Marshall's office also (after the Army is encamped), having taken a view of all the Posts and Guards of the Camp, to appoint all the Regiments in what manner they shall place their Corps of Guards, Scouts, and Sentinels, so as no man may pass either in or out, but to be continually upon their discovery. Likewise, the Lord Marshall must provide for all other Reparations, Fortifications, and Strengths which are to be made for the safety of the whole Army. And as thus in the constant

settling of the Army, so in the marching and removing thereof, the Lord Marshall is to have an especial regard to his strength and ability to encounter with the Enemy, and whether the times be ripe for matters of execution; or else to defer and keep off all occasions of encounters in which, if he find himself the weaker, he shall then order his Marches through rocky mountains and as ill accessible places as he can find out; thereby to add a natural strength to his Army so as the Enemy may in no wise assault him. At the same time he must still have the lighter sort of Horsemen to march so near unto the Enemy that continually upon every alteration he may have a speedy notice of any particular preparations. But if the necessity of the march be through fields and plains where the nature of the ground affordeth no assistance, then the Lord Marshall must by all politic devices make his Cavalry, or Horse Army, appear so great and innumerable as is possible, which (being the greatest executioners in such victories) will not a little amaze and distract the Enemy in his approaches. So on the contrary part, reputing himself the stronger, the Lord Marshall is to observe all advantages and by the discovery of his Scouts to take opportunity and to charge at the best advantage.

Lastly, as in Encamping and Marching, so the Lord Marshall is to hold especial regards in the removing of the Camp, whether it be by night or day. In which as the day Remove is audacious and bold without any respect of ceremony, so must the night Remove be full of policy, silence, and great diligence, and the march or good array to be held with all care and industry; for this manner of Remove is but one hair difference from flight, and therefore it requireth all the skill and art of the Lord Marshall and all the care and obedience that can be required in the Soldier, for it is a Rule in Martial Discipline that no Remove by night can be absolutely secure. Then being done without security, it must needs infer necessity, and that necessity requireth all the strength which can be comprehended either in Art or Valor.<sup>34</sup>

The King himself, not the General of the particular army, chose the man who was to be the Marshall of the Field. Consequently, Surrey's appointment as Marshall of the Field of the army commanded by the Duke of Norfolk at this time could not have been due solely to a father's unjustified partiality; it

<sup>34</sup> Francis Markham, *Five Decades of Epistles of Warre* (London, 1622), p. 189 ff. (To make this long quotation more readable I have emended a number of phrases and somewhat modernized the spelling.)

indicates that Surrey's knowledge and skill as a military leader must have been even more marked than is shown by the records previous to this date.

vi. In the assembling of the English army at Calais, Surrey's desire for physical action was gratified. As Marshall of the Field, he found plenty of official tasks to occupy his energy. Poetry was forgotten in making ready for the campaign, preparations for which were dispatched by the middle of June. The English army was divided into two parts. The Duke of Norfolk was commander of one. The other, called "The King's Battle" because Henry meant to take command of it in person, was at this time put under the leadership of the Duke of Suffolk.

Before the end of June the English army moved. So did the Imperial army. But neither was bound for Paris. There is "no instance in the first half of the sixteenth century of two sovereigns heartily combining to secure any one object whatsoever."<sup>35</sup> Each of these English-Spanish allies was seeking to force Francis to grant concessions to him—and to himself alone. Neither the English King nor the Spanish Emperor actually wished to destroy France as a political entity. His ally might get hold of too much territory in the process. The English-Spanish treaty not to make a separate peace with France, Charles and Henry would consider binding only so long as neither thought he could profit more by breaking it.

The Spanish army from the Netherlands started towards Paris in accordance with the joint plan drawn up by the two monarchs. But this army did not follow the joint plan for long. By Charles's orders, the Spanish troops stopped before St. Dizier. Although the possession of this town was of slight use in a campaign against Paris, Charles saw fit to lay siege to it; and as he intended, the delay made impossible the continuance of his march on Paris.

Henry first sent the Duke of Norfolk and his army from Calais under secret orders. Going around to the left of Boulogne, these English troops met ten thousand foot and three or four thousand horse of the Emperor. This combined English-

<sup>35</sup> A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, pp. 411-412.

Spanish army immediately laid siege to Montreuil. On 7 July Hertford had written to the Duke of Norfolk, "His Ma[jes]t[y] hath willed us to signifie vnto youe, to be kept secret vnto your lordshippe and Mr. Treasurer, that His Ma[jes]t[y] myndith hymself to lay siege to Boulogne."<sup>36</sup> Henry VIII had never intended to march on Paris. Boulogne was his true objective from the beginning. Norfolk had been directed to move against Montreuil for a twofold purpose: the English King had to pretend to be carrying out his agreement with Charles; he also wished to delude the French into leaving Boulogne poorly protected.

Possibly Charles, faithless himself to his ally, was sceptical of Henry's show of marching on Paris, but the French were completely misled by the Duke of Norfolk's movement toward Montreuil. Maréchal du Biez, a skillful and experienced French commander at Boulogne, was drawn out of that city. Thinking to delay the English movement on Paris, he hurried to hold Montreuil as long as possible. Nevertheless, historians agree that if Henry and Charles had carried out their agreement to the letter, Paris would certainly have fallen into their grasp.

In marching against Montreuil the English met with many difficulties. Before the juncture of English and Imperial troops on their way to Montreuil was made, the Spanish were to furnish guides and some provisions to the English. The provisions were not forthcoming, and the guides were unfit or treacherous. As the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Surrey, and others of the Army Council wrote on 4 July,

Haveinge no guydes but suche as they geve us, [we] have bene brought suche waies as we thinke never armye passed, uppe and downe the hills, thoroughe hedges, woodes, and marresys [marshes], and all to cause us to lodge upon the Frenche groundes, savenge their awne frendes. And, besides that, we have bene so well kepte fastynge from drynke, that a good parte of tharmye have onely dronken water sithe yesterdaie sevyntyght. We have not forborne to speke quicklye to them [guides]; and also I, the Duke of Norfolk, have wrytten to my Lady Regent [Queen Marie] 2 tymes veray quicklye, shewyng unto Her, that oneles the promyses made

<sup>36</sup> B. M., Harleian MS. No. 6989, fol. 127.

unto us to be furnysshed of vittailles be better kepte, than it hathe bene unto this tyme, I feare His Majesty, in their defaulte, shall not be able taccomplishe his promes made to thEmperour.<sup>37</sup>

Such conditions made the tasks of Surrey, the Marshall of the Field, unusually difficult.

Nor were Surrey's cares lessened when the juncture of the English and Imperial forces was finally made before Montreuil. The Imperial generals had marked out in advance the site which they thought the English camp should occupy. Distrustful of his allies after the harrowing difficulties of the march, Surrey had merely to look over the spot to see its faults. Access to the site was difficult, and it was too far from Montreuil. The English soldiers would wear themselves out getting to and from the scene of military operations. Surrey promptly reported to his father, his commander, that the place would not do for the English camp. He then had to find a more suitable ground nearer to Montreuil. As the council of the English army reported the matter to the King's Privy Council,

Yestreday [3 July], beinge to githers with us Messieurs de Reux [Roeulx] and Bewers [Buren] and Countye de Wynes [Wimes; the commanders of the Imperial troops], they all said we shulde have removyed as this daye to a place by them namyd within 2 myles of Monstrell [Montreuil]. Whereapon beinge often disseyved, wee (thErle of Surrey, Lord Warden [Sir Thomas Cheyney], and Poynges] went to view the ground, where was neither grasse nor forage for horses, and suche hylls and passages that it was unpossyble for tharmye to passe that wayes; and therefore ar enforced this daie not to go so farre, but to take a nother nerr hande. And I, the Duke of Norffolk, with others of us . . . with a good bande of horsemen, woll ryde and view the campe,<sup>38</sup> where we shall lye to morowe at night, which we truste shalbe within a lege of Monstrell. We be enforced thus to travaile to view the campe without trustyng to their reportes. And yet, thoughte we speke quicklie, me muste of force handle them with gentle wordes, or els they mae displease us at their pleasure in kepinge vittailles frome us.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII, IX, v, 996.*

<sup>38</sup> Upon the Marshall of the Field fell the duty of choosing the camp.

<sup>39</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII, IX, v, 996 ff.; Bapst, p. 298.*

The circumstances under which the English and Imperial troops joined together on 5 July to undertake the siege of Montreuil were a severe test of the self-control and diplomacy of the young English Marshall of the Field. To preserve the semblance of harmony between the allied armies, he was called upon to hide his opinion of the stupid tactics (or cunning machinations) of the Spanish, to disregard their dicta without rousing their open antagonism, while the English troops were disposed to the best advantage and the Spanish commanders cajoled into accepting the revised plans. That Surrey performed his duties satisfactorily is additional evidence that he was never rash, never made a tactical blunder, when in charge of troops.

vii. The English movement on Montreuil had caused the Maréchal du Biez to rush to its defense with about three thousand men from Boulogne and to leave the real English objective under the command of his son-in-law, Jacques de Coucy, Lord de Vervins. A young and inexperienced officer, he had not over five hundred soldiers to defend his charge. As soon as the English learned that their ruse had so weakened the garrison, the Duke of Suffolk was ordered to move against Boulogne with "The King's Battle," which invested the city on 19 July. Having crossed the Channel on 14 July, on the twenty-sixth Henry VIII arrived at Boulogne to push the siege in person.<sup>40</sup>

The English troops before Boulogne were well taken care of. Both provisions and military supplies were plentiful. Nothing was lacking to enable them to take the town. Quite the contrary was true at Montreuil. The Duke of Norfolk's numerous requests for necessary supplies were unheeded. There seemed to be no way he could get sufficient military materials. Although Norfolk wrote earnestly and repeatedly both to the Privy Council in England and to the Army Council at Boulogne, he wrote in vain. Neither would send to Montreuil sufficient food, ammunition, or artillery. Nor was the money to pay the troops forthcoming. Plead as he would, the Duke of Norfolk's letters were disregarded.

<sup>40</sup> Hall, p. 861.

The straits in which Norfolk found himself came, probably, from two sources. The first was that Henry VIII had no real desire to take Montreuil at this time. He had ordered the attack on that city merely to mislead the French and to pretend to be fulfilling his agreement with the Emperor to march on Paris. The King kept Norfolk there only to uphold this pretense and to hinder the French from sending relief to Boulogne. The second source of the Duke's troubles was the Earl of Hertford's jealousy of the Howards. Hertford, being then an influential member of the Privy Council, was seeking to destroy the positions of both Norfolk and Surrey. From the time of their going to France in June he maligned their actions there, sought to keep them from getting supplies, and hoped to destroy the King's confidence in their military abilities. As the King was not interested in capturing Montreuil, Hertford had little difficulty in cutting down Norfolk's and Surrey's commissariat and choking off their ordnance. It is doubtful, however, that he succeeded in destroying Henry VIII's trust in the Howards' military skill, although the Duke of Norfolk is reported to have said at the time:

Sorry am I that it is my fortune thus in my old days to be spoken of. But it is often seen that such men's doings be taken much better than some other men's be: and often times it chanceth words to be spoken of some in their absence, for whom such as they most esteem to be their friends will scarcely answer.<sup>41</sup>

In spite of the niggardly way supplies were sent to them, the Duke of Norfolk and Surrey pressed the siege of Montreuil with zeal. As he had not the ordnance to carry its walls by storm, Norfolk cut off all its supplies and almost forced it to surrender. "We know of truth," Norfolk wrote to the King, "that many of them eat horse-flesh; and some of their soldiers, gentlemen, Italians, are glad to eat of a cat well larded and call it dainty meat."<sup>42</sup>

Upon Surrey fell the task, as Marshall of the Field, of getting food for the English soldiers. As his regular commissary failed, he scoured the countryside for whatever provisions he could find. For this purpose, Surrey and other leaders made

<sup>41</sup> Nott, p. lxvi.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. lxvii.

numerous short expeditions during which they destroyed many villages in plundering their stores. The most brilliantly executed of these the Duke of Norfolk reported to the Council before Boulogne on 2 September:

With hearty recommendations this shall be to advertise your good Lordships that this evening Monsieur de Bewers [Buren] with his band, and my son of Surrey, my Lord of Sussex, my Lord Mountjoy, my brother William, my Lord Latimer, Mr. Treasurer, and all the rest of the noblemen whom I sent further upon Saturday at ten at night, returned hither to this camp this night at seven o'clock, without loss of any man slain, and have made a very honest journey, and have burnt the towns of Saint Riquier and Riew, both walled towns, and also the fauxburg of Abbeville, on this side of the town, where the English horsemen had a right hot skirmish; and after the coming of the whole army [of the Duke de Vendôme] retired without loss and burned all the country. And they of Crotey, fearing our men would have laid siege to the castle, burned their own town. Our men have brought a very great booty of all sorts of cattle. The noblemen and gentlemen kept their footmen in such order that they borrowed nothing from the Burgonians [meaning the Emperor's troops under Buren gave no assistance], and finally have made such an excursion that the like hath not been made since these wars began.<sup>43</sup>

Although the Duke of Norfolk lauds the expedition as a whole without especially praising his son, the last sentence of his report shows that he is proud of Surrey's conduct. As Marshall of the Field of the English army, Surrey probably was the leader of the English troops on this raid. Norfolk knew that it was unnecessary to mention this in his report, but he is careful to point out that the Imperial troops, over whom Surrey had no control, contributed little to the success of the expedition.

Having had the opportunity of calling attention to Surrey's military skill without obviously singing his son's praises, Norfolk sent Surrey to report to the King by word of mouth the situation at Montreuil. Accompanied by Lord William Howard and his friend and squire, Thomas Clere, Surrey reached the English camp before Boulogne on 11 September. If the Earl of

<sup>43</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres. V, 21; printed by Nott, appx. XVI.



Hertford's attempts to slander the Howards had made the slightest impression on the King, he showed no trace of it in his manner at this time, for Surrey was received very graciously.

The English sappers had undermined the walls of Boulogne.

Thursday, the 11<sup>th</sup> of september in the afternoone the erle of Surrey and the lord William Howarde came from Monstreull to t[h]e King's Majestie; the same daye the trayne of powder was set to the castell, and the King's Majestie accompanied with the said erle of Surrey and the lord William went to his standing to see the castell fall; at which fall many of oure men [English pioneers] were hurt with stones which flewe very farre off.<sup>44</sup>

A large breach having been made in the walls of Boulogne by the explosion of the mine, the English prepared to attack the town with all their forces. Before they could storm the breach, however, the French commander, De Vervin, offered to surrender the town. Terms were agreed upon and the treaty of surrender was signed on 12 September. De Vervin carried out the agreement in spite of the intervening violent storm which destroyed the organization and temporarily disrupted the fighting forces of the English.<sup>45</sup>

Surrey accompanied Henry VIII to receive the keys to the city on 14 September. Immediately after this ceremony he hurried back to Montreuil with the news of the taking of Boulogne.<sup>46</sup> He took with him the King's promise to dispatch reinforcements to the Duke of Norfolk in order that Montreuil might be carried also.<sup>47</sup> But Henry procrastinated. The English did not take over the city of Boulogne until 18 September. Meanwhile the additional troops necessary to storm Montreuil successfully were not sent to Norfolk. Not until 25 September, when it was too late, did the reinforcements leave Boulogne. This delay has been attributed to the influence of the Earl of

<sup>44</sup> *Diarium super viagio Regis, obsidione et captione Bononiae*; printed by Bapst, p. 301.

<sup>45</sup> De Vervin was later charged with treason for the surrender of Boulogne, it being said that the Earl of Hertford gave him 150,000 rose nobles to surrender the city. He was convicted of this accusation, condemned, and beheaded; see *Mém. de Maréchal de Vieilleville*, in *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la France*, XXIX, p. 31, as printed by Nott, appx. XXII.

<sup>46</sup> *S. P., Henry, VIII*, X, v, 1030.

<sup>47</sup> *L. & P.*, XIX, ii, 230.

Hertford.<sup>48</sup> Perhaps so, but it must be kept in mind that Henry VIII had little desire to win possession of Montreuil.

News reached Montreuil that Charles V, contrary to the terms under which he and Henry had undertaken hostilities against France, was negotiating a separate treaty of peace with Francis I. Such a treaty would enable Francis to turn all his military strength against Henry VIII. The same day this news reached Norfolk the English scouts discovered that the French were moving in great force to raise the siege, making it necessary for the English to retreat or to take Montreuil before the belated English reinforcements from Boulogne arrived. The English decided to attack, and on 19 September, with Surrey leading the inadequate English force, they tried to carry the walls by storm.<sup>49</sup> The attempt was almost successful, due to Surrey's personal bravery. After a "right warm" fight, he broke through the Abbeville Gate to establish himself there with a small force. But the move was not properly supported, although the English held the position against great odds until Surrey was struck down. Having lost their leader, Surrey's men began to retreat and the attempt to take the town failed. Only the courage of his squire, Thomas Clere, prevented Surrey from being captured. Fighting his way almost alone, Clere reached his injured lord and assisted him back from the gate. In doing so, Clere unfortunately received the wound which caused his death the following April. In acknowledgement Surrey wrote, as a tribute to be inscribed on Clere's tomb, the sonnet:

Norfolk sprang thee, Lambeth holds thee dead;  
Clere, of the County of Cleremont, though hight.  
Within the womb of Ormonds race thou bred,  
And sawest thy cousin crowned in thy sight.  
Shelton for love, Surrey for lord thou chase;—  
Aye, me! while life did last that league was tender.  
Tracing whose steps thou sawest Kelsall blaze,  
Laudersey burnt, and battered Bullen render.  
At Muttrel gates, hopeless of all recure,  
Thine Earl, half dead, gave in thy hand his will;  
Which cause did thee this pining death procure,

<sup>48</sup> Bapst, p. 296 ff.

<sup>49</sup> In general I follow the reconstruction of this by Nott, p. lxxviii.

Ere summers four times seven thou couldst fulfill.  
Ah, Clere! if love had booted, care, or cost,  
Heaven had not wonne, nor earth so timely lost.<sup>50</sup>

In his tribute Surrey probably exaggerated his own injury, for he recovered from it in time to attend the Council of War which the Duke of Norfolk called to deliberate on 26 September.<sup>51</sup> As the English army was enfeebled by sickness and so few in numbers (especially as the Emperor had ordered Count de Buren to withdraw his troops), the Council decided that it would be folly to risk a general engagement with the French force which was drawing near. To avoid this, a prompt retreat was necessary. News of this necessity was dispatched to Henry VIII, who gave permission for the Duke of Norfolk to retire. He did, however, order the Duke, before breaking camp, to send a message to the Maréchal du Biez to the effect that Henry VIII did not wish to arouse Francis I's antagonism further by taking from him another town, thus creating an obstacle to the peace so much desired by all Christendom, "the [English] Kinges Majeste having alwayes had more regarde to the commun welth of Christendom then to his private commoditie."<sup>52</sup>

Norfolk may have forwarded the message to the French commander of Montreuil without a smile or a chuckle to himself, but he ordered Surrey to rush the English preparations to withdraw. Camp was broken on 28 September and the English retired towards Calais by way of Boulogne. As Marshall of the Field, Surrey had the task of seeing to the evacuation of all the English ordnance and supplies. His also was the duty of closing the rear of the retreating army. That he accomplished both tasks without the loss of men or materials, in spite of the great superiority of the French army pursuing, is another instance of his competence as a military leader.

Learning of the approach of the French Dauphin with this great force of 50,000 foot and 10,000 horse, Henry VIII fled from Boulogne on 30 September to Calais, and thence to England. The Duke of Norfolk, retreating from Montreuil,

<sup>50</sup> Padelford, p. 99.

<sup>52</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII*, X, v, 1039.

<sup>51</sup> *L. & P.*, XIX, ii, 307.

reached Boulogne the next day, and leaving a force under Sir Thomas Poynings which he thought adequate to defend the captured city, Norfolk followed Henry VIII to Calais. Surrey remained with his father's command and at Calais continued to execute the Duke's orders.<sup>53</sup>

The King, although heretofore he had shown the greatest confidence in the military skill of the Duke of Norfolk, took him to task severely for not remaining at Boulogne with all his troops. Why he did so, unless his action was instigated by the Earl of Hertford, is a mystery. Even the Duke of Suffolk's letter of 7 October,<sup>54</sup> which upheld Norfolk's action, did not pacify the King. Continuing his reprimands, on 8 October he ordered Norfolk to return to Boulogne with all his forces if possible.<sup>55</sup>

As the Dauphin attacked Boulogne the night of 9 October, it was not possible for Norfolk to return to that city. Nor was it necessary. The Dauphin's failure to retake Boulogne demonstrated the soundness of the English leader's action. Although the French did achieve some success at the beginning of their attack, they were repulsed and lost heavily before the engagement was over.

This attack concluded for the winter the large activity of the war. The English held Boulogne while the French were encamped close by in possession of the neighborhood. Charles V had concluded a treaty of peace with Francis I on 19 September. Throughout November Henry VIII strove to negotiate a general peace between the English, the French, and the Spanish. As this failed, Henry was left to face, for the first time in his life, an actual French invasion of England.<sup>56</sup>

viii. It is questionable whether Surrey spent the winter in England or returned to Boulogne.<sup>57</sup> Du Bellay<sup>58</sup> describes as an

<sup>53</sup> *L. & P.*, XIX, ii, 434.

<sup>54</sup> *P.R.O.*, Fr. Corres., V, 47; printed by Nott, appx. XX.

<sup>55</sup> *P.R.O.*, Fr. Corres., V, 48; printed by Nott, appx. XVIII.

<sup>56</sup> A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 413.

<sup>57</sup> Nott, p. lxxiv, must be mistaken in writing that Surrey "was present at a Chapter of the Garter held at Hampton Court on Christmas day," 1544, for no such meeting is recorded in *Garter*, II, 429-432.

<sup>58</sup> *Collection universelle des mémoires*, XXI, p. 206.

eye witness a successful sortie from Boulogne against the French led by Surrey early in January, 1545. Although some writers think Hertford was in command,<sup>89</sup> the accepted facts of the action agree with Surrey's usual military tactics. The French army under Maréchal du Biez had been put into winter quarters at Pourtet, a village before Boulogne. To command the harbor there, they were building a fort which would enable them to prevent English communications and supplies from reaching Boulogne. Surrey (Hertford?) at the head of 4,000 foot and 700 horse crossed the river at low tide. Taking the French by surprise, he was able to force them to retire in confusion to Montreuil. Du Bellay adds that the badness of the roads prevented Surrey from following or the French force might have been utterly destroyed.

<sup>89</sup> Nott, p. lxxv, "Holinshed [as does Hall] speaks of Hertford as the person who commanded. Herbert, in his MS. collections, speaks of Surrey as having had the command. In his published account he is silent respecting him." Cf. also *S. P., Henry VIII*, X, v, 1106 (p. 289, note 1).

## CHAPTER VII

### "LIEUTENANT GENERAL OF THE KING"

The late winter and early spring of 1545 Surrey probably devoted largely to the building of his residence on Mount Surrey. While he was on the Continent progress had been interrupted, but upon his return he set men to work again in hope of having Surrey House completed before autumn. To this end he spent most of his time in Norfolk, and until the latter part of April he rarely visited the Court.<sup>1</sup>

During this time the Duke of Norfolk remained in London. When he returned to England in the late autumn of 1544 he had, Brenan & Statham<sup>2</sup> believe, expected to go north immediately to resume charge of the English forces on the Scottish Border. The quelling of the Scots there had been the charge of the Howards for two generations. By renewing his successes on the Border, Norfolk hoped to dispel the prejudice which seemed to have arisen in the King's mind against him. But Norfolk was not sent north. With the excuse that the rigorous winters of the Border would be bad for his health—an excuse which Norfolk had been advancing for years—the Duke was held at court, where the Privy Council continued to seek and to take advantage of his advice in many matters, although he may not have been given the personal honor and consideration which had formerly been his.

Even when the English forces in the north were crushed by the Scots at Ancrum Moor, 17 February, 1545, the Duke of Norfolk was not sent to restore order there. Nevertheless, the King could not, or would not, give up the services of the Howards. No other family in England had furnished military ability of equal use to Henry VIII. England and France were still at war. While the French continued their attempts to retake Boulogne, making the English defense difficult and expensive, Francis I was also making ready to launch an armada

<sup>1</sup> At least there are no records of his presence at the Court.

<sup>2</sup> P. 393.

against the southern coast of England. Charles having broken his agreement not to sign a separate peace with Francis, Henry was left without an ally. When spring came in 1545, bringing with it the renewal of the larger martial activities of the French, Henry VIII's coldness toward the Howards disappeared.

ii. Surrey House was not yet completed when Surrey had to return to court in April, but the work was continued in his absence. Henry VIII was affable. On 21 April, Surrey by the King's command was able to purchase complete harness from the King's armorer, for which he paid £10.<sup>3</sup> Two days later he attended the Chapter of the Order of the Garter held "at the Mannour called St. James's, near the Palace of Westminster."<sup>4</sup> The Feast of St. George was celebrated at Windsor on 17 May. Both Surrey and his father attended this ceremony as Knights of the Garter and were honored as befitted their high positions. About this time also both were awarded commissions "to arrange and collect the Benevolence which the King by advice of his Council has decreed towards defence against the French King."<sup>5</sup>

iii. Henry VIII was planning to send an army under the Duke of Suffolk to relieve Boulogne by driving off the French troops besieging it. Upon his return to court, Surrey learned that he was to be given command of the vanguard of this army and received orders to raise and equip men to form the basis of his command. As soon as the weather permitted, he began to enlist East Anglian and Essex veterans who had served under the Howards in former campaigns. The raising of levies for foreign service was slow work, and throughout June, Surrey was busy gathering men. By the first of July, however, he had brought his troops from the north to London, where their numbers were to be augmented by additional levies.

Meanwhile, Francis I, now faced with but a single enemy, had decided that attack was the best defense. Having gathered

<sup>3</sup> *L. & P.*, XX, i, 558.

<sup>4</sup> *Garter*, II, 432.

<sup>5</sup> *L. & P.*, XX, i, 623 (VIII).

together at Le Havre a large number of war vessels, he dispatched a strong fleet to harass the English shipping and to threaten the English coast. This French fleet made impossible the movement of English troops across the Channel, even if Henry VIII had seen fit to lessen the defenses of his realm when invasion threatened. As Surrey could do nothing further with his vanguard at this time, he was attached to the person of Henry VIII in the capacity of what would now be called an aide-de-camp.<sup>6</sup> As such he was sent to the south coast on various duties. One of his errands carried him to Portsmouth, where the English navy, under Lord Lisle, was then stationed. While Surrey remained with the fleet he had an opportunity to show his knowledge of naval warfare. About July 20 the French fleet of two hundred sails appeared off the Isle of Wight. Surrey, being then with Lord Lisle, propounded an excellent plan for destroying them without risk to the English. The English Admiral would not, however, act upon Surrey's scheme without consulting the King, for which purpose he wrote, 21 July, to Henry VIII

as required through my lord of Surrey, . . . a "purpose" suggested to him by a gale of wind from the west which they had for a while yesternight. The masters say that the French fleet ought to be able to ride out such a gale, even if it blew "too a corse and a bonett off" where they are, but if we came under sail towards them they must loose anchor and abide us under their small sails; and once loosed, they could not with that strainable wind fetch the Isle of Wight again and would have "much ado to escape a danger called the Awers."<sup>7</sup>

As Lisle would do nothing without writing for royal sanction, his delay enabled the French fleet to escape from this dangerous position before the King could approve Surrey's naval strategy.<sup>8</sup>

Sailing away from the Isle of Wight, the French fleet sought to land forces at Seaford, in Sussex, but found the coast so well protected that their ventures were useless. Francis discovered

<sup>6</sup> Bapst, p. 310.

<sup>7</sup> *L. & P.*, XX, i, 1237.

<sup>8</sup> Perhaps the granting to Surrey and Norfolk of licenses to alienate the "manor of Rushwood, & site, etc." (*L. & P.*, XX, ii, 266 (36)) was in acknowledgement of their services in defense of the realm.



that the landing of an armed force in England was much more difficult than he had thought. Discouraged by the strength of the English preparations to resist invasion, he decided to abandon his aggressive plans in order to concentrate his forces on retaking Boulogne.

iv. The withdrawal of the French fleet left the English in command of the Channel. Surrey then turned to getting his levies ready for immediate embarkation to France. On 9 August the Privy Council wrote "to my Lord of Surrey, who before was appoynted to have the leading of V<sup>m</sup> [5,000] men to the other syde of the see," to await further orders.<sup>9</sup> Ten days later the embarkation was under way.

While Surrey was leading his men to France he received an unexpected boon. The sudden death of the two chief English leaders in France cleared the way for his advancement. On 25 August, Paget, the King's Secretary, wrote to the Duke of Norfolk:

My lord of Suffolk [who was to command the new army being sent to France] died [22 August, and] . . . my lord Poyninges [Poynings commander of Boulogne] died [18 August] . . . My lord Grey is appointed to his charge [at Boulogne], and my lord of Surrey, who went over with the five thousand men, is to be general of all the crews at Guines and the Marches, a goodly band of eight thousand men. [This is] "ment to hym for the best and [is] in consideracion of the desyre he hath to se and serve."<sup>10</sup>

But the sudden death of these military men struck Henry VIII as a bad omen. Urged by the Privy Council, he abandoned his aggressive plans for the present. But he was determined to defend that which he held. Lord Grey of Wilton was ordered to turn over his command at Guines to Surrey and to take charge of the defense of Boulogne.

Having taken command at Guines, Surrey promptly began to reorganize the English forces there. Whenever it was possible, Surrey favored a mobile force and freedom to maneuver. To this end he requested permission to encamp his men outside

<sup>9</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, I, 226.

<sup>10</sup> *L. & P.*, XX, ii, 209.

the walls of Guines, where they could be used as a much more flexible weapon than when cooped up in the town. The Privy Council granted his request with unusual dispatch, addressing letters to Surrey from Oteland, 29 August, "for encampeng nere Claeswood according to his owne devise."<sup>11</sup> From this camp Surrey moved to attack the garrison at Ardres, which the French were using as a concentration point. Having deployed his men in strategic position, Surrey tried to draw the French outside their walls. Although the French could not be enticed into a general engagement and avoided the trap which he had set, Surrey was able to entangle them in a large skirmish on 2 September. In this skirmish the French were badly defeated and the Commander of Ardres, Baron de Dampierre, was slain.<sup>12</sup> Before Surrey could follow up his victory he was moved to a higher command.

v. At the King's behest, the Privy Council decided on 31 August that Surrey, not Grey, should be placed in charge at Boulogne.<sup>13</sup> Letters Patent to this effect were issued 3 September.<sup>14</sup> Lord Grey was returned to Guines, and Surrey ordered to take over command of Boulogne at once.

Surrey's command at Boulogne was the height of his military career. Sent to replace Lord Grey, who had been simply "Captain of Boulogne," Surrey was given not only that title; the patent designated that he was to be "Lieutenant General of the King on Sea and Land" for all the Continental possessions of England.<sup>15</sup> This was an unusual citation, a very great honor, and an acknowledgment that Surrey had proved his ability as a military commander. Unlike some sixteenth-century monarchs, Henry VIII did not let the claims of birth determine his choice of military commanders. He placed in command those who he thought had the greatest abilities; he left in command only those who were successful. For him to place a man of only twenty-eight years in such a high command was without precedent.

<sup>11</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, I, 237.

<sup>12</sup> Nott, p. lxxvii; *L. & P.*, XX, ii, 307.

<sup>13</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, I, 238.

<sup>14</sup> Rymer's *Foedera*, XV (London, 1728), p. 80.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

vi. The English forces were poorly organized and the defenses of the city were in a very bad way when Surrey arrived at Boulogne. Although the city and its environs were constantly harassed by the French troops under Maréchal du Biez, Surrey set about putting his forces in order and strengthening his defenses. The excellence of his work proved Surrey to be a competent general as well as an efficient Marshall of the Field and a successful leader of headlong attacks and raiding expeditions. One of his first steps was "to rid all harlots and common women out of Boulogne and [to] enquire whether any head officers had received money above their entertainment and appointed their servants to certain charges whereby the King was ill served."<sup>16</sup> Provisions and supplies had to be landed and carried inside the walls in spite of the cordons of French troops surrounding the city. Moreover, the French commander changed his base of operations. Moving from the left bank of the Liane River, where he left about four thousand men in a fortified camp to finish the building of Fort Chatillon, Maréchal du Biez occupied Mount Lambert. This mount being the plateau crowning the slope on which Boulogne was built, the new French position was above the city and so near that artillery could shoot into the town and the English fire from inside the walls could reach the French camp.<sup>17</sup>

From their new position the French could prevent the sending of supplies from Calais to Boulogne by land. Fort Chatillon, when completed, would command the harbor and cut off the provisioning of Boulogne by sea. By this strategem Du Biez hoped to force the English to come outside the walls of Boulogne to protect their lines of communication. Surrey refused, however, to be drawn into the open. He was too skillful a military leader to risk his poorly organized troops in a general engagement when outnumbered five to one by the French. As long as Fort Chatillon was unfinished the French could not choke off the English supplies by sea. Surrey turned his efforts to retarding the building of this fort. This he did by sending small forces of horsemen to threaten the working Frenchmen. If the French threw down their tools and rushed together to

<sup>16</sup> *L. & P.*, XX, ii, 439.

<sup>17</sup> Bapst, p. 317.

defend themselves, the English drew back. If the French did not organize their defense promptly, the English rushed in, killed a man or two, destroyed what they could, and hastily withdrew. Surrey's method accomplished its purpose.

vii. But it was not only the French that made Surrey's defense of Boulogne difficult and hazardous. The English Privy Council thought that, in the face of the determined efforts of the French to retake the city, the holding of Boulogne was too expensive. Almost without exception, the members of the Privy Council favored an attempt to bargain with Francis for returning Boulogne to him peacefully.<sup>18</sup> Henry VIII, however, was proud of his conquest. Former kings of England had held vast territories in France. Calais, with its environs, was the only remaining possession of England on the Continent when the Tudors grasped the English Crown. Henry VIII had imperial aspirations. He longed to unite Scotland to England and to regain England's lost possessions in France. The taking of Boulogne was a step in this direction.

So ardently did Henry VIII wish to hold Boulogne, in spite of the difficulties and the expense,<sup>19</sup> that the Privy Council dared not openly oppose him in this. The Council feigned to humor him while devising some means to change the King's mind. Flattering Henry VIII with praises of his usual far-sightedness and caution, the Council suggested that His Majesty request Surrey to send further material as to the strength, resources, and value of Boulogne as an English base of operations. This should be done, the Council added, before undertaking to destroy the French forces which were trying to recapture the city.

Henry VIII took this suggestion as his own thought and ordered the Privy Council to write to Surrey demanding full particulars of the situation at Boulogne. This letter, as drawn up by the Council, hinted that the King had been favorably

<sup>18</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII, X, v, 1229* (p. 617 note 2); see also notes below.

<sup>19</sup> A ms. note in a copy of Lord Herbert (Bodl. Lib., Fol. A 624, p. 443) reads, "Our kings charges in winninge and keepinge Boulogne was 1,342,552 [pounds], 3 [shillings], 7 [pence]."

impressed by Surrey's previous reports, which had presented the English position at Boulogne as capable of being brought to a good end.

Arguments of economic and political expediency had no great weight to Surrey, who also differed with his father as to the best means of combating intrigues against the Howards at Henry VIII's Court. He believed in holding what he had, and if necessary, openly defying his enemies. Moreover, he was enjoying his military duties and carefully devising plans for thwarting the schemes of the French as they sought to oust the English from Boulogne. A fortnight after taking over his command he had sent Richard Cavendish to England with reports and dispatches. When Cavendish came before the Privy Council he immediately recognized the hostility of its members towards holding Boulogne. Thinking to curry favor, he chose to neglect Surrey's instructions and "volunteered to bring before the King certain matters highly prejudicial to the retention of Boulogne."<sup>20</sup>

The Privy Council's misleading letter to Surrey, which demanded fuller particulars of the situation at Boulogne, was then dispatched. At the same time the Duke of Norfolk, who as a member of the Privy Council knew its true attitude toward keeping Boulogne, wrote to warn his son:

With this ye shall receive your letter sent to me by this bearer; by the which I perceive ye find yourself grieved for that I declared to the King such things as Cavendish showed to me. This I did by his desire; showing the same of his behalf without speaking of you. And if he will say he desired not me to show the King thereof, ye may [declare] he saith untruly. [As] the King was hawking for a pheasant at the time, he desired me as the King went home to declare the same to His Highness.

This is true, and Cavendish was taken here not of the best sort. Ye may be sure I do not use my doing of any sort that may turn you to any displeasure. But have yourself in await that ye animate not the King too much for the keeping of Boulogne; for who so doth, at length shall get small thanks. I have so handled the matter if any adventure, as you have suggested, be made to win the new

<sup>20</sup> Brenan & Statham, p. 398.

fortress at Boulogne [meaning Camp Outreau and Fort Chatillon] ye shall have the charge thereof. Therefore look well to what answer ye make to the letter from us of the Council. Confirm not the enterprises contained in them.

Having written the premises, Mr. Paget [the King's Secretary] desired me to write to you in no wise to animate the King to keep Boulogne. Upon what grounds he spake it, I know not; but I fear ye wrote something too much therein to somebody. And thus with God's blessing and mine, fare ye well. From Windsor, 27 September at night.

Your loving father,  
T. Norfolk<sup>21</sup>

As Surrey's replies to his father's letter and to the Privy Council's misleading request have been lost, how he responded to these particular letters is unknown. But later correspondence shows that Surrey did not heed his father's advice. He continued to support the King's resistance to the desire of the Privy Council to give up Boulogne.

Some believe that Surrey was "in some measure actuated by his pecuniary embarrassments, which were very heavy."<sup>22</sup> This is untrue, for his office at Boulogne was not a lucrative one.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, the last of October, Thomas Hussey, who was in the service of the Duke of Norfolk, wrote to Surrey:

This present Thursday my lord's Grace, your father, told me of your request for the access of your wife and children to Boulogne and what answers the King made him therein. . . . [This request was refused.]

Shelton would have you write for him, for he thinks that my Lady of Richmond, your sister, will stay him upon his account.

My lord [of Norfolk] asked how far forth I was with Ruckwood touching the sale of Rochford. "What way," he asked, "taketh

<sup>21</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 88; printed by Nott, p. 178. Thinking this and the following letters relating to Surrey's command at Boulogne to be of general interest for the light they throw on the conduct of military activities in the sixteenth century, I quote from this correspondence at length, in edited form and modernized spelling.

<sup>22</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII*, X, v, 1229 (p. 617, note 2.)

<sup>23</sup> Thomas Hussey to Surrey, 6 November, 1545: "Forasmuch as your estate [in Boulogne] is thought chargeable, and yet more chargeable . . . there is no hope of any recompense out of the King's coffers"; *L. & P.*, XX, ii, 738. See also Bapst, pp. 321-323.

my son for payment of his debts" I answered, "I know not." "Well," quod he, "he oweth Fulmerston an honest sum. And what oweth he you," I answered, "So much as I can be content to forbear in respect to his necessity." And so I gather that my Lord, your father, will make some stop in your bargain for Rochford for payment of your debts. Handle Fulmerston discreetly and send your resolute answer. The money must come wholly to your hands, for you can not both pay your whole debts and furnish your present necessities.

Albeit, the provision of those things for the furnishing of Surrey House which were committed to Southwell's charge will not be obtained at your father's hand, we shall make shift for them upon my credit in this town. My lord of Norfolk is determined that your revenues at Lady Day last shall be received by the steward, and the overplus paid to your ministers. Your father's Lordship remains in as good fame on this side the seas as your lucky succeedings have prospered happily on that side.

Handle the matter wisely for the sale of your lands, for my lord of Norfolk said he would see your debts paid. And by these means and others ye may be made wary of your will of Boulogne. As my trust is in you, burn this letter.<sup>24</sup>

The cost of Surrey House had put Surrey heavily in debt. Although the construction was finished at last, Surrey was hard put to get furnishings which would be suitable for the magnificent building. But he was not to be bribed into urging the King to give up Boulogne by misrepresenting the conditions as he saw them there. Perhaps he also suspected that the Earl of Hertford had influenced the Privy Council to make up this scheme in hope of being able to entangle his rival to his discredit. Possibly Surrey thought the Duke of Norfolk had been hoodwinked, that he had been inveigled by his secret enemies into supporting the plan by stressing the expense of holding Boulogne. Norfolk was never liberal with money, either his own or the King's. Furthermore, Surrey was doubtless enjoying the life at Boulogne. Though he longed to have his wife with him, the activity there was otherwise sufficient to occupy his abundant energies and satisfy "the desyre he hath to se and to serve." There was frequent fighting, with at least a small skir-

<sup>24</sup> *L. & P.*, XX, ii, 658.

lish daily. Most important of all, he knew that as long as he could continue to defeat the French in these skirmishes—and he was meeting with continuous success—he could forestall his enemies' attempts to destroy the King's confidence in him.

Surrey's enjoyment of his command at Boulogne showed in his reports, much to the pleasure of the King and to the disgust of the Council and the Duke of Norfolk. As a result, on 6 November Thomas Hussey again wrote to warn Surrey of his father's displeasure:

My Lord, to be plain with you, I see my lord's Grace, the Duke of Norfolk, somewhat offended in seeing your private letters to the King's Majesty of such vehemence as touching the animating of the King's Majesty for the keeping of Boulogne, and in especial considering the Duke's divers letters addressed to your lordship, to the which, as he thinketh, ye have given simple credence or little belief. For what his Grace and the rest of the Council worketh within six days for the render of Boulogne and the concluding of a peace, ye with your letters set back in six hours, such importance be your letters in the King's opinion at this time. Albeit that my lord, the Duke of Norfolk, concludeth that ye may by your practices sustain Boulogne for two or three months, yet he thinketh it impossible that it may continue six months, for as much as he certainly knoweth the realm of England can not possibly bear the charges of defending Boulogne. For the proof thereof, the King's Majesty is indebted at this hour above four hundred thousand marks [£300,000], to the leving whereof either by subsidy or other practices at this Parliament there is not to be received above two hundred thousand pounds. . . . Moreover, I have heard the Duke say that he would rather bury you and the rest of his children before he should give his consent to the ruin of this realm, and that he has no doubt but that ye should be removed in spite of your head, work what ye could. . . .

I write plainly, not doubting but that you, my lord, will burn these letters, which for surety I send by my own servant, for letters have been brought to the King's intelligence which were written from one friend to another. If ye shall write any in secrecy, send it by a sure person. . . .

To have my judgment for Boulogne, as I can learn, every Councillor sayeth: "Away with it." And the King and your Lordship sayth: "We will keep it." At the writing of this letter, as I



have perfect intelligence, there is not remaining in the Council (my Lord of Norfolk being absent, who will bark in it to his dying day) a member that dare move the render thereof. Assuring your Lordship that the Council had never so much to do as to stay the King from sending over of 1500 pioneers [military workmen] and 3000 men of war for the better accomplishing of the French fortress according to your late devise. Notwithstanding that the King's Majesty took it in very ill part that ye should adventure your presence in standing upon the bridge of the fortress, for the better viewing of the same during one of your sortees upon it, with two Italians, the one called Tomaso, who hath much advanced your hardiness without forgetting your negligence in adventuring your person so dangerously although ye heard the same Tomaso his advice to the contrary. . . .<sup>25</sup>

Although Henry VIII censored Surrey for his hardihood in "adventuring his person so dangerously," the dash and daring which his lieutenant combined with military skill was actually very pleasing to His Majesty. Knowing this, Surrey felt somewhat secure in his position at Boulogne and steadfastly refused to be bribed by the offer of a more lucrative post, such as the captainship of Guines or the deputyship of Calais,<sup>26</sup> into urging the King to give up Boulogne. But he wanted to make sure that the other forces under his command on the Continent would not be led by his English enemies to betray him. To this end he sought to have a man in whom he placed an absolute trust appointed to a high office at Guines, where Lord Grey was in command. Surrey wrote to Sir William Paget, the King's Secretary, to forward this appointment:

May it please you, gentle Mr. Secretary to give me leave, amid your weighty affairs, to trouble you with an earnest suit. Whereas Mr. Treasurer of Guines is discharged, and some other, as I hear, is to be appointed in his place, it will please you to inform yourself (by the report of such as knoweth) of a gentleman, sometime my servant, and now a captain within this town, called T. Shelley. May it please you to inquire what his conditions and qualities are, and his disposition to serve, and then to square within yourself whether it be meet to recommend for that office such a one at the most effectual request of your poor friend. Of Shelley's rare virtues

<sup>25</sup> P.R.O., State Papers, BB/351; printed in part by Bapst, p. 319 ff. & by L. & P., XX, ii, 738.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

I could write more at large, but I know virtue for itself is to you sufficient recommendation. Moreover, Mr. Palmer awaiteth upon you, who can sufficiently of the ability of the man instruct you. Assuring you, Sir, that I dare promise more of that man, his truth and honesty, than of any man that I know alive. And I should think myself happy to have bred such a servant as I trust His Majesty should find him. And for your favor to be granted that man, I shall most heartily beseech you, and think the pleasure done as to myself. Praying you to pardon my earnest writing, for the worthiness of the man bears it. And thus begging leave to trouble you, I pray to God to send you health. From Boulogne, 20 November.

Your own most assuredly,  
H. Surrey.<sup>27</sup>

viii. In spite of the Privy Council, while Surrey continued to win victories "to the honor and praise of his King" the King continued to support Surrey; and the people continued to support their King. The latter showed their approval of the King's action in the clearest possible way. They granted him money. On 24 November, 1545,

a Parliament began at Westmynster by auctoritie whereof was graunted to the kyng a Subsedy of ii.s.viii.p. [two shillings and eight pence] of the pound of moueable goodes, and iii.s. [four shillings in] the pounce in lande, to be paied in two yere.<sup>28</sup>

At Boulogne Surrey kept the French from finishing their fortress by constantly interrupting the workmen. Until Fort Chatillon was completed the French could not stop the English from landing their supplies successfully. Taking advantage of this, Surrey steadily increased his stores in Boulogne. At the same time he made it difficult for the French to send up supplies to their forces encamped on the left bank of the Liane River. By December the troops there were reduced to want and the French were making strenuous efforts to revictual their fortified camp and unfinished fortress.

On 4 December the French made a determined attempt to bring up provisions to their forces in this camp and fortress.

<sup>27</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 90; printed by Nott, p. 180.

<sup>28</sup> Hall, p. 864.

But Surrey, by a well planned ruse and a sudden attack, forced the French commissariat to turn back. As he reported the matter to the King:

May it please Your Most Excellent Majesty:

The revictualment made by Monsieur De Tays (declared in my last letters) I have learned since upon a more certain intelligence was, besides the sheep and oxen, but sixteen carts laden with thirty pieces of wine. The rest for fear all returned to Montreuil. Whereupon the enemy were constrained with a great force to intend a new revictualment. Whereof I had certain espial that this morning they would come with six or seven hundred horse at the high tide to put in a great number of carts; and that the Almaines had marched from Aussie Chateau and would within a day or twain come to Porthill<sup>28a</sup> to land there such munition as should come thither from Dieppe and Étapes, for lack of carriages to convey the same by land. I first gave an order to your Majesty's ships to keep upon this shore, and this morning, three hours before day, sent forth Mr. Wyatt and Mr. Palmer with a thousand footmen to ambush themselves under the hillside where the church of St. Étienne stood. Because the enemy always kept men at this church to have espial upon us when we should pass the river (as at the last journey we made into Boulonnais, when Mr. Bridges burned Samer Town and all the country there about and spoiled the cattle of the same), Mr. Wyatt, accompanied with the Master of the Ordnance and Mr. Flammock also, captured the church with twelve Gascoigns who would not yield the same.

And I, with Mr. Marshall, this morning at the opening of the gates sallied forth with the ordinary force of horsemen sent out of this town each morning, to the intent the enemy should not discover our ambush if he should send for the same purpose. And so tarrying there looking for them coming, sending the northern men to scout towards Hardelot (who had been posted all the night before to watch the same), I sent Mr. Palmer and Mr. Wyatt with a few horsemen towards the French fortress, to seek out the ground of most advantage for your Majesty's camp, if it should be your pleasure to come to the field the next year.

They took the way towards Porthill, where by chance they found all the French sheep. Fearing lest the victuals would not have come that day and having taken a prisoner of the herdsman with his own hands, Mr. Palmer took occasion to drive him and the

<sup>28a</sup> Le Portel?

sheep towards us, to train the French footmen into the ambush. Which action indeed took such effect that above seven hundred followed the sheep and came more than a mile towards us; so that they could not have escaped us (peradventure with some danger of their fortress) had not the troop of seven hundred horsemen betwixt us and Hardelot been discovered at the same moment. Then we left the sheep and assembled our horsemen upon the hill—and drew out footmen upon the scantling of the hill as nigh as we could, not to be discovered. Mr. Marshall and the cavalry then offered the charge upon them. The enemy seeing but our ordinary horsemen, the flood increased; and having no advertisement of any English footmen that were issued out from Boulogne, they gave without fear the charge upon our men. Our horsemen, seeming to fly, made down to the passage, leaving our footmen upon the left hand; in consequence the enemy, being upon the spur, followed lower to the river than our footmen. Discovering then our footmen, they would have returned, but could not; so that there were taken seven men at arms, which our men would never suffer to recover the hill again. At which charge Mr. Marshall very honestly and headily brake his mace upon a Frenchman. Mr. Shelley brake his staff upon a tall young gentleman of Monsieur de Botyer's band and took him prisoner; and in effect, all the men at arms of this town brake their staves very honestly.<sup>29</sup>

The Frenchmen, having then discovered our footmen, made an offer as though they would charge upon the same; amongst whom, for fear our horsemen (being weak) might make some disorder, I made all our footmen take the trench upon the top of the hill (which the enemy made this year when their camp lay there). This is a very strong plat of ground which I determined to keep, and might well have done so if their footmen had marched, till our succor had come from the town (which succor also I sent for). And then I sent Mr. Dudley, this bearer, his brother, and Captain Clement of the Italians, who most honestly offered themselves to take the hedges near unto the French troop (which was then stronger and nearer unto us, as it seemed to me, than I saw the enemy this year). Our horsemen stood where they might back the footmen, although in regard of our horsemen, God wot, they were right weak. When the Frenchmen saw the harquibuters shoot off they began to retire; and so reinforcing our skirmish, giving Sir

<sup>29</sup> "Brake their staves very honestly" is jargon of the tournament meaning "they fought bravely and well."

Thomas Palmer the charge of the same, we drove them from place to place to the Sandhills, and so from hill to hill to Hardelot. By that time our succors were come from the town: so that we were within the trenches upon the hill fifteen hundred men in square and five hundred at the passage to keep the same on the other side.

We might also discern all the carts swarm up the hill again towards Montreuil (which as I guess had never passed Neuf-Chateau) and might discover five ensigns of footmen coming out of the wood. Whereupon, being then three o'clock and we four miles from home; judging by the fires that we saw in the woods that the Almains were come; and that one of our men did discover nine ensigns of footmen; and also having empeched the thing wherefore we came; by the advice of the rest I thought it meet to return to my charge where I had left Mr. Bridges, Mr. Under Marshall, the Master of the Ordnance, and Mr. Porter. Assuring your Majesty that I think that at the retire the horses of the Frenchmen were well dagged with arrows, and that they were for one day well affrayed. Albeit when they saw our small power of horsemen, they might have retired against our will. Wishing to God that your Majesty, with the surety of your person, had seen the willing hearts as well of the gentlemen and strangers [foreign mercenary men at arms] of this town, as also of the poor soldiers.

This day, I think, if the Almains be come, they shall put in their carts against our will. Yet sent I yesterday for my Lord Grey with his horsemen; with whom, if he come, we shall devise what is further to be done. Trusting that the bitterness of this weather will soon make the enemy weary, and that the Almains shall lose the intent of their journey by reason of your Majesty's ships, which shall prevent the French revictualment by Porthill. And as I hear, they have already taken divers sails laden with herring and coals. Assuring your Majesty that if we had any number of horsemen here, and meat for the same, and certain pinnaces that would do their duty to keep upon this shore, I would hope the revictualling of this fortress should cost the French King dear.

Beseeching your Majesty that your Council of Boulogne present at this journey, the Colonels of the Albanois, and Italians, with the other Captains and Gentlemen of this town, may receive thanks for their good service. Amongst whom I beseech your Highness to be good and gracious Lord to this bearer, Mr. Dudley (who for his towardness and good will to serve hath few fellows in this town); he also hath a brother in the Old Man,<sup>30</sup> a gentleman of as good

<sup>30</sup> "*The Old Man*", of which frequent mention is made in [Surrey's] letters and in all the historians (as well French as English) who notice the siege of Boulogne, was an

sort and as serviceable as I have much seen. Mr. Arden also, both now and at sundry times, for his service hath deserved to be humbly commended by me unto your Majesty. Mr. Adrian Poynings, I assure your Majesty, is a man for his discretion and hardiness of great service. Francis Aslebye, that hurt Mons. d'Aumale,<sup>31</sup> break his staff very honestly.

Trusting that as this ground hath been now (and was in my Lord Admiral's time) happy to your Majesty's service, it shall always so continue. Not doubting but when your pleasure shall be such to keep the field, it shall be seen how the French King hath lost his fortress, as your Majesty would have said if the same had seen us in the field and how easy it is to keep the French in difficulties.

And thus ceasing to trouble your Majesty with the circumstances of this day's happenings, I shall leave the same to the declaration of this said bearer, to whom it may please your Majesty to give credit. I pray to God to preserve your Most Excellent Majesty.

Your Majesty's most humble,

And obedient servant,

And subject,

H. Surrey.<sup>32</sup>

Having been repulsed on 4 December, the French delayed three days before making another attempt to revictual their camp and fortress. When their carts again moved up, Surrey was even better prepared to throw them back, as his report of 7 December shows:

May it please Your Most Excellent Majesty:

According to my formal advertisement sent before, my Lord Grey, having received my message and assembling together such number of horsemen as so short a warning would suffer (to the number of three hundred), arrived here with Mr. Pollard upon

old fortress, or tower, surrounded with works, situated on the left hand to those who entered the harbour of Boulogne, and near the mouth of it. There were works which connected [the Old Man] with the lower town, or Base Boulogne. It was supposed to have been a tower built originally by Julius Caesar when he was preparing to invade Britain, and was therefore called 'The Old Man.' In some maps of those times it is described as being more like a watch tower, or light house, then a tower of defence, as it consisted of several stories"; Nott, p. 172.

<sup>31</sup> Mons. d'Aumale was the eldest son of the Duke of Guise. He later became the Duke of Guise who retook Calais for the French in Queen Mary's reign.

<sup>32</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 92; printed by Nott, p. 181.

Saturday night at eleven o'clock, having made a right painful journey (as well for the bitterness of the weather as for lack of food for his horses here) which he regarded not, in respect of your Majesty's service; for the which I beseech your Highness he may receive his thanks accordingly.

We then jointly resolved to attempt nothing till a further advantage were seen: considering that their horsemen were increased (being no fewer in number than a thousand); their Almaines all encamped upon the border in the wood, beyond Harelott, and those few carts of victuals that they had brought and could spare from themselves, put into the fortress upon Friday at the full sea.

Upon Saturday, at night, they laid a thousand men at Porthill by night to receive the victuals that should come from Dieppe, which was the only intent of their journey. But Mr. Cotton (Vice Admiral of your Majesty's fleet), according to the direction given him from hence by the advertisement of mine espial, lay for them to seaward at Somme Head; so that in the morning he might descry the enemy of forty sail. As he made at them the men of war that were their conductors fled first and the victuallers escaped into Somme, saving seven that were overtaken by your Majesty's fleet and captured. Whereof these seven vessels, six were laden with meal and salt beef, and the other with wine. These boats were wonderfully well devised only for the revictualment of the fortress by Porthill, for they are of great stowage and drawing but three feet of water. Beseeching your Majesty that Mr. Cotton may receive his thanks accordingly and referring unto your Highness's most prudent consideration of what importance this service is, whereby (besides the ruin of their horsemen and footmen by the extremity of the weather) their whole purpose is for this present disappointed.

On Sunday at night (fearing lest they had returned their carts to Montreuil for more victuals) we resolved that this morning before day we should lay our whole ambush of horsemen and footmen at St. Étienne and towards Harelott, to see whether by any alarm at the break of day we could draw the enemy into our ambush. We intended the rest of the day to have kept our trenches with some field pieces, and with our horsemen to have done our best to prevent their revictualment. To this intent, we sent afore night a few horsemen to dodge them to their lodging. But upon the news of the taking of their ships, as I think, the whole camp retired towards Montreuil, chafed for choler, and yet I think right well a-cold.

The prizes and captured boats, saving that of wine, I have been so bold to retain here for the revictualling of this town. I trust, if these sails attempt to come again, to do some service with the same captured vessels, considering that I might put in each of them seven score men. I think it not unmeet that your Majesty saw them: to the intent such like might be provided for the revictualling of this town from Calais by stealing along the shore, for which purpose only these boats were made. Thus may your Majesty perceive with what difficulty this fortress of theirs may be victualled that they shall be driven to make an army by sea and by land to discharge the same at Porthill.

Finally; whereas Sir Thomas Palmer and Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Younger<sup>33</sup> (whom your Majesty from ignorant men hath framed to such towardness and knowledge in war, that as I am able to judge of that I understand not myself—none other dispraised—your Majesty hath not of their behavior and youth many the like within your realm for both their hardiness, painfulness, circumspection, and natural disposition to the war) have desired license to repair into England, in this time of least service, to settle their private affairs (which for their zeal to your Majesty's service they have long neglected). I have thought it good to beseech your Majesty to give them credit for the declaration of such conferences and discourses as we have had together concerning the order of your Majesty's wars on this side of the sea (which hath proceeded, I take God to witness, rather of a care beyond all other affections to your Majesty's service than to any presumption of knowledge). I hope your Majesty will at least take in good part the humble advertisement upon the sight of things here which are written from time to time by him, whom most unworthy, your Majesty hath placed here. Neither do I think it my duty to use any other means for the declaration of the discourse of any service to be done here than to report directly to your Majesty. Beseeching your Highness that these Gentlemen may know that I have not unremembered to your Majesty their divers and sundry good services done to you.

And thus I pray God to preserve Your Most Excellent Majesty.

Your Majesty's most humble,  
And obedient servant,  
And subject,  
H. Surrey.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Surrey's companion in the escapade in the streets of London.

<sup>34</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 93; printed by Nott, p. 186.



Surrey's success in foiling the French plans held in abeyance the schemes of the Privy Council to get the King to give up Boulogne. The King took great interest in Surrey's reports and acted upon many of the suggestions they contained. As the finishing of Fort Chatillon, which would then command the harbor, constituted the only serious threat to the security of the English in Boulogne, Henry VIII urged Surrey to forward plans for removing this danger by capturing the fort. During December Surrey sent to the King several suggestions for taking this fort.<sup>35</sup> On 29 December, 1545, Henry VIII dispatched to Surrey the following letter:

Right Trusty and Right Well-Beloved, We greet you well:

This is to let you know that minding to have sundry matters (touching as well the advancement of our affairs as the empeachment of our enemies) groundly considered, We have presently dispatched unto you this bearer, Bellingham (one of the Gentlemen of Our Privy Chamber). To him, as being at good length instructed of Our pleasure, you shall give full credence. . . . And wherefor the special trust and confidence We have in our trusty and right well beloved servant, Bellingham, We have addressed him unto you for the declaration of sundry matters of great importance.

Touching the advancement of our affairs and the annoyance of our enemies: We have thought good to signify unto you that our pleasure is: You shall not only give firm credence unto him in such things as he on Our behalf shall propose unto you; but also after conferring both with him and John Tomaso (whom We have especially appointed to repair thither with him), you shall con-

<sup>35</sup> Bapst, p. 325, believes that Surrey visited England between December 7 and 18 in order to have a personal interview with the King. His evidence is a letter to Surrey of 21 March, 1546 (P.R.O., State Papers BB/159), which contains the statement "Upon consideration of all such letters as have been written from thence [Boulogne] and also of such informations as hath been gyven unto His Highness by mouth here by your Lordship." As no correspondence has been preserved which was written by Surrey to the King, or *vice versa*, between the dates Bapst mentions, no proof can be offered that Surrey did not visit England in December. Nevertheless, "such informations as hath been gyven unto His Highness by mouth here by your Lordship" in all probability means "information delivered orally by your messengers" (note the frequency with which Surrey mentions in his written reports such means of communication), for the correspondence between Surrey and the King during the fortnight following 18 December is filled with questions concerning Surrey's plans for the defense of Boulogne—with questions which could hardly have failed to be discussed by two people meeting for that special purpose.

sider together with others of Our Council at Boulogne by what means and with what numbers the enemy's fort may be taken, surprised, or won; you shall also consider what annoyance can either that way or any other ways be done to the enemies upon a good and mature consideration. Whereof, if you shall think the said fort to be attempted and decide to go in hand therewith, Our pleasure is: in respect of the good experience and forwardness of our said servant, make use of him that he may become of better estimation as may both agree to the place whereto We have called him and at the same time give him occasion to declare that earnest service which We are well assured he meaneth and will not fail to see executed when any good occasion shall serve.<sup>36</sup>

Surrey had anticipated the King's request embodied in the above letter. When Bellingham arrived at Boulogne, Surrey already had a plat drawn up. This plan of attack was shown to Bellingham, who approved it. Surrey then dispatched Rogers, one of his principal engineers, to carry to the King the plat and this letter:

Pleaseth it Your Most Excellent Majesty:

Whereas of late I was so bold as to dispatch unto your Highness Sir Thomas Palmer and Sir Thomas Wyatt to declare my poor opinion by what means this new fortress might be best attempted (the overture whereof it pleased your Majesty to command them then to defer until it were seen what success the treatise of peace, then hand, were like to have); and whereas, having received commandment from your Highness by Mr. Secretary to give order for the war in all your Majesty's pieces here; I was so bold that after I had revisited the grounds of most advantage in the company of Mr. Marshall, Sir Thomas Wyatt, and Sir Thomas Palmer (who jointly have consented to this devise), I caused Giles, your Highness's servant, to draw a plat in order to send the same by Rogers to your Majesty. And then having lately received letters and credit from your Highness by Mr. Bellingham to the effect that I (and the rest of your Majesty's Council here) should with him and Tomaso (who is not yet arrived here) consult by what means and with what numbers this fortress might be won, I have yet not thought it good to stay the dispatch of Rogers, to which dispatch I have made privy only Mr. Bellingham, Mr. Marshall,

<sup>36</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 99; printed by Nott, p. 190.

Mr. Wyatt, and Sir Thomas Palmer. In the meanwhile, till your Majesty have returned to us your pleasure in this matter, I mean to consult with the rest of your Highness's Council here, and to advertise the general opinion of us all.

Beseeching your Majesty to give credit to Rogers in that which he hath to declare in my behalf; touching as well my foresaid opinion, as well as the misery that the French fortress now standeth in (which is such that if the great revictualment now prepared might be empeched, your Majesty should never need to besiege the same). By this your Highness shall perceive your garrison here hath done their duty to keep the fortress so short that the enemy is driven with half a camp to revictual the same. The power that they have assembled, as I hear, is their old band of Almaines (which be now not much above two thousand men) and as many Picards or more, with five hundred men at arms.

For as much as this new fortress is an annoyful neighbor to your Majesty's town of Boulogne and the county of the same (and that if the enemy have commodity the next year to finish the same, the difficulty will increase), I would wish that your Majesty should besiege the same as timely as all necessities may be prepared and the time of the year is meet for men to lie in the field. The only difficulty wherein, that I see, is the conveyance of victual hither to Boulogne; for after the French King hath put his ships into the seas, this can not be done without a navy. Your Majesty's only means to win the fortress, as me seemeth, is to anticipate the enemy in the field and to encamp so strongly in the strait in divers places (trenched the one from the other) that no relief of victual may pass: thus your Majesty can win the fortress by a determination to famish the same, while in our strength of position and entrenchments we hold off the enemy without having to fight in the open. This, with trenches and a mount in every camp, the nature of the ground considered, seemeth unto me feasible.

The great difficulty in all your Majesty's wars here hath ever been of the lack of horsemen (of whom the service is either in battle to encounter the like of the enemy, or to convey the victual). In this case a small number may serve, considering that in my devise (as it appeareth by my plat) our victual once landed is conveyed to us within the precinct of our camp, without danger of other enemy but the fortress. Moreover, if the French King's navy be not upon the seas, the victual may be landed with boats within the creek of Portet (which is also within our camp). And if your Majesty shall anticipate the enemy in the field (and con-

sidering the ruin of his country and the small number of men that he hath already assembled, unless he were advertised of your Majesty's enterprise, he cannot be prepared for the field so timely) so shall it not be possible for him to refresh the fortress with any great mass of victual by land. In this way, if your Majesty would betimes give order that your ships might keep upon this shore, I think the fortress would be starved before the season of the year would serve the enemy to put his gallies into the sea.

For the numbers of men and all other things necessary for this enterprise, I remit the same most humbly to your Majesty's consideration. Albeit, a great number of pioneers is requisite, yet for the expedition of the fortifying of the camp (wherein consisteth the surety of the whole enterprise) there is no doubt but every soldier will set his hands thereto. This done, it seemeth to me that with the new camp, the sea, the river, and your Majesty's pieces on the other side, there was never fortress more straitly besieged and more desperate of succor. The army of the enemy, be it never so great, shall not be able to get to us, being strongly entrenched, and having taken already the advantage of the highest grounds (which we can interlace with trenches, the one hill to the other, and receive our victuals always in surety). Also, in this way in your Majesty's pieces a small garrison may serve.

If this devise shall seem good unto your Highness, it shall be meet that in the meantime were placed here a good number of horsemen to interrupt the small revictualments and make the fortress the meeter for the other enterprise (wherein the secret and diligent preparation in time for necessities is most requisite, but chiefly the presence of your Majesty's navy by sea importeth the whole success of the enterprise).

And whereas your Majesty (for lack of answer to the dispatch of the Clerk of the Council of this town) hath in wages still as many Captains and double-pays for the number of soldiers that here now remaineth as when there were here the whole eight thousand men, it may please your Highness, remembering your charge, to return to your resolution to send more men. If, however, you are of the mind to reduce the companies of footmen to three hundred; then, out of such Captains as shall be dismissed, it might please your Majesty, besides them that shall serve for the ordinary garrison, to choose some Captains of the most experience and service and keep them without men, but with the wages of a Captain. So shall they be here occupied in a place of service, and when Your Highness shall amass more footmen those Captains

shall be in readiness to take the leading of them. The new men by this means can sooner be made useful than when the men and Captains both are without experience. The charge thereof shall not be great, and the comfort to your subjects here will be much greater when they shall see that your Majesty will entertain them still for their passed service. Beseeching your Majesty to remember them severally with some letter of comfort, which shall afresh encourage them most willingly to adventure their lives (according to their most bounden duty) in your Majesty's service. So shall your Majesty's letter wipe out of their hearts the fear that they have conceived that your Highness should gather some suspicion of them concerning the excessive allowance before the time of further service. Assuring your Majesty, upon my most bounden duty to You, that although I can speak only of what has transpired since my coming hither, I dare say at this present there was never Prince more truly served in money matters. With the advice of your Highness's Council here, I think there is set so direct and certain orders for the payment of the garrison that there is in effect no gate left open to deceit.

Mr. Southwell will inform your Majesty, at his return, that he findeth at this present that your Highness's affairs go directly. If there were any fault before time, on my faith, I think the foreign trouble of the enemy was rather the cause than any black spot or lack of duty here to your Majesty.

On the contrary part, if your Majesty shall determine on war defensive, your Highness shall do well to resolve in what order your fortifications shall proceed. Upon knowing your pleasure, every way I shall travail to the utmost of my power to forward your Majesty's contentions. . . .

It may be the French will attempt to revictual their fort by water. I assure your Majesty that I can not yet see how they can bring this about if this weather continue. Nor could they do so when the weather would serve if your Highness would give order that your ships might keep upon this shore. Assuring your Majesty that these six days their whole garrison hath lived with biscuit and water, having neither wood nor coal. Whereupon, learning of the want to which the enemy are reduced and suspecting that the French will soon attempt a revictualment, I have sent for the horsemen of Guines to come (if the weather will suffer them to do so) to help prevent the revictualment. I have ordered the horsemen of Guines to bring hay with them by land, for we

have had none here these ten days. If they come, there shall be nothing left undone that shall be thought meet to do with surety to your Majesty's pieces.

Finally, it may please your Majesty to receive herein enclosed my simple discourse concerning the attempting of the fortress, and pardoning my folly, to accept my good intent. Beseeching your Highness that this bearer may know I most humbly commended his honest service here unto Your Majesty, and that Giles may perceive your Highness taketh in good part his honest travail. Giles desireth your Highness to pardon this plat<sup>37</sup> made in haste, and promiseth to present your Majesty with another shortly to the full perfection. He came hither for his own affairs, but hath been stayed by me for this purpose.

And thus I pray God to preserve Your Most Excellent Majesty.

Your Majesty's most humble,  
And obedient servant,  
And subject,  
H. Surrey.<sup>38</sup>

Although the more detailed explanation and plat of Surrey's proposals to the King have been lost, this letter furnishes additional proof that Surrey, in spite of his love of action, was prudent and cautious in military affairs. He could order and lead headlong charges when the best strategy was boldness. Nevertheless, he sought to accomplish his object with the least possible risk and cost, without unnecessarily exposing his men to danger.

The discretion and wisdom of Surrey's plans to force the French back from Boulogne pleased his Majesty. His Lieutenant at Boulogne was serving him well, he told his Privy Council. But before the King could reply to Surrey's suggestions a "defeat and victory on both sides" took place at Boulogne. This changed the whole situation.

<sup>37</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Calig. E. ii, fol. 270, contains a plan, in mutilated condition, for defending Boulogne, said to be Surrey's, though not in his hand.

<sup>38</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 1; printed by Nott, p. 191.

## CHAPTER VIII

### RECALLED FROM BOULOGNE

The last year of Surrey's life began ominously. It was ushered in by the first and only military setback that he suffered as Lieutenant General of the King on sea and land for England's Continental possessions. This reverse of fortune, indicative of the force of circumstance which was to bring Surrey to the executioner's block shortly after the next New Year's Day, came about through no oversight of the English commander. Surrey was not at fault. The result was determined by an unexplained action which he could neither foresee nor forestall.

This skirmish—for it can be called nothing more—took place on 7 January, 1546. Only a minor engagement, its result made no change in the military situation at Boulogne and would be of little importance if Surrey's enemies at the English Court had not successfully seized such a slight opportunity to create a temporary misunderstanding between him and the King.

Until this time the success which had attended Surrey's encounters with the French troops about Boulogne had surprised even the Duke of Norfolk, most astute of the English military men. As the King's Secretary wrote:

My Lord of Surrey now of late has often times had good success against the enemies. Having burnt both the town and ships at Étaples and since that time distressed their victuals often times coming towards their new fort, he has brought the French in such misery that (partly for want of victuals and partly for want of wood and other necessities) there have died above four hundred persons within the same fortress within the space of fifteen or sixteen days.<sup>1</sup>

Being in such great distress, Fort Chatillon had to be re-victualed or abandoned. Maréchal du Biez decided to move in force with the necessary provisions.

<sup>1</sup> *S. P., Henry VIII, XI, v, 1303 (p. 16).*

Surrey's system of military intelligence was effective.<sup>2</sup> His "espial" brought him the information that the French were going to make a determined attempt to relieve their fortress. Upon learning this, Surrey sent out additional scouts. These scouts reported on the evening of 6 January that a large number of heavily laden wagons were coming, following as closely as possible to the seashore. The wagons were escorted on the left by over five hundred horsemen and protected on the right by a body of four thousand mercenaries. Surrey acted promptly. The next morning he started moving his men out of the walls of Boulogne to intercept the French supply train. Having assigned six hundred foot soldiers to occupy St. Étienne, a hill in front of the French camp, Surrey sent out all the horse he could muster to make further reconnaissance. When he received word that the French were near, Surrey left two thousand men to defend Boulogne while he led the remaining foot (about two thousand) to join his outpost at St. Étienne. There he put his forces in order of battle.

As the French felt secure in their numbers, without hesitating they advanced with their supply train. Surrey, true to his usual method, had deployed his men in a strategic position. When the French drew sufficiently near he ordered his front line to charge. The move caught the French unprepared. The French horsemen in particular, believing themselves protected by the foot soldiers on their right, were taken unaware. In spite of the English inferiority of numbers, the French began to retire, leaving their laden wagons for the English horsemen to demolish and burn. Surrey's tactics were succeeding admirably. The French were on the point of being routed when the English second line, for no known reason,<sup>3</sup> suddenly retreated. As soon

<sup>2</sup> The following description of the skirmish is a digest of the varying contemporary accounts, French as well as English.

<sup>3</sup> Contemporary records offer no satisfactory explanation for this failure of the second line. In view of what followed, it would seem to have been caused by those who sought to shake the King's confidence in Surrey. Such methods were not unknown at the time, and one is forced to agree with Nott, p. lxxxiii, "It was hard on Surrey that he might not plead in his defence an excuse once used by Lord Dacres, to account for a similar panic among his men, through which he had lost 800 horse. He assures the King it was all owing to evil spirits, and that he had credible witnesses to prove that the devil himself had been seen no less than six times that night among the baggage. Birch MSS. No. 3139."



as this happened the French turned upon the unsupported first line of the English, and after a sharp but short struggle, forced it to fall back. Because the second line had failed to support them, several of the many Englishmen of high rank in this first line were killed. The French then pressed forward, making it necessary for all the English to retreat behind their fortifications.

But Surrey had accomplished his purpose. The French supply train was almost entirely destroyed. Only twenty of the wagons laden with provisions reached their destination. Du Biez, prevented from getting his supplies into the fortress, was forced to retreat to Montreuil.

ii. Not only do the records fail to explain the breaking of the English line of battle. Unless one reads into contemporary correspondence evidence that the ensuing misunderstanding between Surrey and the King and his Council resulted from the machinations of those who were determined to bring about Surrey's downfall, the contradictions in the surviving records are bewildering.

The next day after the engagement the Council of Boulogne sent to the King the following dispatch:

May it like your Most Excellent Majesty to know:

Having certain espial that Monsieur du Biez was set forth from Montreuil with six hundred horse and three thousand footmen to relieve the great necessity of the fortress (which we have mentioned in our former letters), we took yesterday before day the trenches at St. Étienne with six hundred footmen. At the same time we sent out both Mr. Ellerkar with all the horsemen of this town and Mr. Pollard with two hundred horsemen which he had brought the night before from Guines to discover whither their camp marched. (Their camp overnight we had discovered by their fires at Nouclier,<sup>3a</sup> six miles on this side of Montreuil.) As our horsemen passed by Hardelot, Mr. Pollard was hurt with a culverin in the knee and died thereof the night following—of whom Your Majesty had a notable loss.

Our horsemen discovered the French march beyond Hardelot. I, the Earl of Surrey, was promptly advertised of the discovery. Whereupon, according to the order agreed upon amongst us, I

<sup>3a</sup> Hucqueliers?

issued out with Mr. Bridges, Sir Henry Palmer, Sir Thomas Palmer, Sir Thomas Wyatt, and two thousand footmen (leaving within your Majesty's fortifications two thousand footmen and the rest of the Council here, divided among the defensive works).

By the time that we had set our horsemen and footmen in order of battle without the trench of St. Étienne, the enemy was also in order of battle on this side of Hardelet and had put on their carriages by the sea's side towards the fortress. Whereupon, having discovered their horsemen not above five hundred, and the footmen about four thousand, we pondered the value of attacking them, for the destruction of this force might have imported no less success than the winning of the fortress. After having considered the courage and good will that seemed in our men (the surety of your Majesty's pieces being provided for) we decided to present them the fight with a squadron of pikes and bills (about three score in file), two wings of harquebussiers, one of bows, and our horsemen on the right wing. Many of the Captains and Gentlemen were in the first rank at their own request, which was granted because they were well armed in corselets. The battle of the Almaines came towards us likewise with two wings of harquebussiers and two troops of horsemen.

Mr. Marshall, Mr. Bellingham, Mr. Porter, Mr. Shelley, and Mr. Granado, with all the horsemen of this town and those from Guines, gave the charge upon their right flank and brake their harquebussiers. Their horsemen fled and ours followed the victory, killing and slaying till they came to the carriages. There they paused to destroy the French stores, whereof they brake and spoiled four score and ten carriages (accounted by tally this morning). Our squadron then joined with the Almaines, with a cry of as great courage and in as good order as we could wish. But by the time our first rank and the second were come to push of the pike, there grew a disorder in our men, and without cause the second line fled. At which time many of our gentlemen were slain, although they gave as hearty an onset as hath been seen, and could but have had good success if they had been properly supported. So started, our fleeing footmen could not be halted in any position that we could use till they came to our trenches on St. Étienne Hill. But even after being well settled there (which is such a place as may be kept against an attack of all the French camp) our soldiers forsook these trenches and crossed the river. This gave the enemy courage to follow them; albeit the night drawing then on, they followed not far beyond. Assuring your Majesty that

the fury of the English footmen's flight was such that it booted little the travail that was taken on every strait to stay them. And so seeing it was not possible to stop them, we suffered them to retire to the town.

In this meanwhile, our horsemen (who had been so successful and thought all won) turned to find this disorder behind them. They were then fain to pass back over the river at a passage a mile beneath Pont de Brique and succeeding in returning without any loss, having slain a great number of the enemies: whereof we have yet no certain advertisement. Thus was there loss and victory on both sides.

And this morning we sent over afore day to number the dead. There was slain of our side two hundred and five: whereof were Captains Mr. Edward Poynings, Captain Story, Captain Jones, Spencer, Robertes, Basforde, Wourth, Wynchecombe, Mr. Vawse, and a man at arms called Harvy. Captain Crayford and Mr. John Palmer, and Captain Shelley, and Captain Cobham missed but not found. All these were slain in the first rank. Others were there that escaped: among whom Mr. Wyatt was one. Assuring your Majesty that there were never gentlemen served more hardly. They should have had better fortune if disorder had not chanced among our footmen, who fled without cause when all things almost seemed won.

The enemy took more loss than we, but for the gentlemen: whose loss is much to be lamented. And this day we have kept the field from the break of day, for the enemy retired to Montreuil immediately after the fight and left their carriages distressed behind them. Not twenty carts entered into the fortress, and that biscuit.

Beseeching your Majesty, though the success hath not been such as we wished, to accept the good intent of us all and consider that it seemed to us, in a matter of such importance, a necessary thing to present the fight. And beseeching your Majesty that Mr. Ellerkar may know we have humbly recommended unto your Highness his good service, which was such that if all the rest had answered in the same manner the enemy had been utterly distressed. May it please your Majesty to give him credit by the declaration thereof more at large.

Further: whereas Mr. Henry Dudley was one of those of the first rank that gave the onset upon the enemy and is a man to be esteemed for his knowledge, heart, and of good service, may it

like your Highness to be his good and gracious Lord. And whereas Mr. Poynings, late Captain of your Majesty's Guard here, is deceased, if your Highness shall think Mr. Dudley able to succeed him in that room, we request at our humble intercession that he may be admitted thereto, if it may so stand with your most gracious pleasure.

And thus beseeching your Highness to accept our poor service, albeit the success in all things was not such as we wished, yet was the enterprise of our enemies disappointed, and the defeat of their enterprise could not have been otherwise done. We beseech your Majesty to consider that more of their part were slain than of ours, that the fortress is in as great misery as before, and that only the sudden flight of our second line kept us from a full victory. And if any disorder there were, we assure your Majesty it was no default in the rulers, nor lack of courage on their part. It was the fault of a humor that sometimes reigneth in Englishmen.

Most humbly thanking your Majesty that it hath pleased the same to consider the payment of the men here. Such payment shall much revive their hearts to adventure most willingly their lives in your Majesty's service, according to their most bounden duty, in order to make recompence for the disorder that now they have made. And thus we pray to God to preserve your most excellent Majesty. From your Highness's Town of Boulogne this 8 January, 1546.

Your Majesty's most humble,

And obedient servants,

And subjects,

H. Surrey.

Hugh Paulet.

Richard Cavindish.

Henry Palmer.

John Bridges.

Richard Wyndebank.

[Postscript.] Whereas we think that this victual that they have put into the fortress can serve for no long time (wherefore it is to be thought the enemy will attempt the like again shortly), it may please your Majesty to resolve what is further to be done by us. For the declaration of our poor opinion therein, we are sending Mr. Ellerkar to your Majesty, to whom may it please your Highness to give credit in that behalf. The present tempest of the weather being such, we have thought it meet to send these before and to stay him for a better passage.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 2; printed by Nott, p. 198.

Owing to the hostility of the Privy Council to the keeping of Boulogne, on 10 January Surrey also sent Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Younger, to report to the Council the details of this partial defeat and to explain how so many men of prominence had lost their lives. As Surrey's letter to the King has been preserved in the Public Record Office and his note commending his messenger, Wyatt, to the Privy Council has found its way into the British Museum,<sup>5</sup> proof exists that Surrey's written and verbal reports reached London. Nevertheless, several days after his messengers arrived at the Court the Privy Council wrote to Surrey:

Our right hearty commendations unto your good Lordship:

These may be to advertise you that the King's Majesty, understanding by such private advertisements as have come from Boulogne (as well as otherwise), that Sir George Pollard is slain and that his Majesty's enemies and you have encountered together, cannot but marvel very much that in so many days you have advertised hither no part of that matter. If your success have been good, his Majesty thinketh you should have done well to have communicated your good luck unto his Highness, who might (upon knowledge thereof) not only given thanks to God and rejoiced with you, but also by his great wisdom have considered and devised such things as might have tended to your further success and comfort and to the increase and furtherance of your well doing hereafter. And, of the other side, if your chance at this time have not been even so good as you would have wished, yet his Majesty (who of his great clemency considereth the uncertainty and unstable chance of the wars) knowing the truth might and would perchance have resolved upon such order for the redubb and supply of this loss that it was not expedient to have deferred all this while to send advertisement. Therefore, his Majesty hath specially commanded us to require you to advertise without further delay the very truth and whole circumstances of this chance, and that from henceforth, as often as any such matter or other worthy advertisement shall grow, you shall fail not from time to time to advertise his Majesty of the full truth thereof accordingly.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Harleian MS. No. 283, fol. 341; printed by Nott, p. 203.

<sup>6</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 94; printed by Nott, p. 196; dated by *L. & P.*, XX, ii, 970 & XXI, i, 49.

As late as the 18 January, Paget wrote to Surrey, taking him to task for not reporting to the King his "skirmish with the French." Having expressed his discouragement by reason that there were no letters from Surrey, five or six days having passed without news, Paget pointed out, "His Majesty, like a Prince of Wisdom, knows that who plays at a game of chance must sometime lose." He also declares his confidence "that the Earl had in the rearguard of the battle placed some men of wit and experience 'which when against all order of fight and against the appointment of the chieftain, seeing the horse flee (as they took it), if they so thought and fled so are not greatly to be blamed.'"<sup>7</sup>

Why should these demands be sent for further information when Surrey had sent complete written and verbal reports? The Privy Council and Paget reveal in their letters considerable correct knowledge of what happened. In fact, the knowledge of the encounter of 7 January revealed in these letters is sufficiently extensive to lead us to suspect that Surrey's enemies on the Privy Council had been able to keep Surrey's official reports from the King while they, purporting to have had advertisement from other sources than Surrey's reports, gave his Majesty only bits of information derogatory to Surrey.

But the direct effect of this affair on Surrey's later life has been magnified out of all proportion to the facts that can be determined. Though the data are very confusing and contradictory concerning the attitude of the King and Privy Council towards the result of this engagement on 7 January, no positive evidence can be offered in support of the almost unanimous assumption of earlier writers that the outcome of this one skirmish contributed directly to and was the beginning of Surrey's downfall.

The correspondence between Surrey and the King and the records of the Privy Council reveal no immediate withdrawal of the King's favor from Surrey. The Privy Council, outwardly at least, accepted Surrey's judgment that it was a "loss and

<sup>7</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 81.

victory on both sides." They even belittled the English losses in a letter to Bishop Gardiner and others, writing "The Frenchmen will doubtless report it as a great victory, because in the disorder they got one or two of the captains' ensigns. Our men, however, gained their object."<sup>8</sup>

iii. During February, Paget, the King's Secretary, wrote to Surrey several times of the King's plans to send additional forces to France under the command of the Earl of Hertford. Though these letters have been cited as evidence that the King had lost confidence in Surrey's military ability, such an interpretation is a misinterpretation. It is true that as commander of these new levies Hertford would become chief in command on the Continent, but Surrey's being superseded in such a manner implied no dissatisfaction with him and was in no way discrediting. In 1545 the King had intended to send the Duke of Suffolk with additional troops to take charge of the larger summer activities in defense of Boulogne, although the commander of Boulogne, Sir Thomas Poynings, had recently been created Lord Poynings as a reward for his military accomplishments. Paget's letters imply no royal lack of confidence in Surrey. To the contrary, his letter of 20 February proves that Surrey could not have been in the King's disfavor. On that date Paget wrote to Surrey:

My Very Good Lord:

With most hearty commendations, it may like you to understand that I have received your letter of the sixteenth of this present month and communicated the same to the King's Majesty for answer. Whereunto his Highness requireth your Lordship to depech from thence all Captains, with their officers, as you wrote could be discharged; for his Majesty knoweth not how to employ the same. Nevertheless, if there be any Captain of the discharged who is a special man of service, his Majesty would, ere your Lordship discharge him, be advertised of him, to the intent further order may be given for him as his Majesty shall think good.

As touching the want in the Old Man, it shall be supplied as soon as may be done conveniently.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 65.

My Lord, the latter part of your letter, touching the intended enterprise of the enemy, giveth me occasion to write unto you frankly my poor opinion, trusting your Lordship will take the same in no worse part than I mean it. As your Lordship wisheth, so his Majesty mindeth to do somewhat for the endamaging of the enemy. For that purpose his Majesty hath appointed to send an army over shortly, and my Lord of Hertford shall be his Highness's Lieutenant-General at his being in Boulonnois. Whereby I fear your authority of Lieutenant shall be touched, for I believe that the later ordering of a Lieutenant taketh away the commission of him that was there before. Now, my Lord, because you have been pleased I should write mine advice to your Lordship in things concerning your honor and benefit, I could no less do than put you in remembrance how much in mine opinion this shall touch your honor if you should pass the thing over in silence until the very time of my Lord of Hertford's coming over thither, for so should both your authority be taken away (as I fear) in Boulonnois, and it should also fortune ye to be abroad without any place of estimation in the field. This state the world would much muse at, and (though there be no such matter) think you were rejected upon occasion of some negligence, inexperience, or other such like fault: for so many heads, so many judgments. Wherefore, my Lord, in my opinion, you should do well to make sure betimes by petitioning his Majesty to appoint you to some place of service in the army: as to the command of the Foreward or Rearward, or to other such place of honor as should be meet for you. So should you be where knowledge and experience may be gotten, whereby you should the better be able hereafter to serve and also, peradventure, to have occasion to do some notable service, which should be to your reputation in the world, in revenge of your men lost in the previous encounter with the enemy. Furthermore, being hitherto noted as you are—a man of noble courage and of a desire to show the same in the face of your enemies—if you should now tarry within a wall (having, I doubt not, a show of your authority touched), it would be thought abroad, I fear, that either you were desirous to tarry in a sure place of rest, or else the credit of your courage and forwardness to serve would be diminished. In such event I fear also that you should be taken here for a man of little activity or service.

Wherefore, in my opinion, you shall do well and provide wisely for the conservation of your reputation to sue to his Majesty for a



place of service in the field. Wherein, if it shall please you to use me as a means to his Majesty, I trust so to set forth the matter to his Majesty that he shall take the same in gracious part and be content to appoint you to such a place as may best stand with your honor. And this counsel I write unto you as one that would wish you well; trusting that your Lordship will even so interpret the same and let me know your mind herein betimes.<sup>9</sup>

As Paget expressed himself to be so certain that the King would willingly give Surrey command of the Rearguard or Vanguard of this new army, the King must have retained a high opinion of Surrey.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, Paget was evidently able at this time to fulfill his promise to secure such an appointment for Surrey. He wrote on 25 February,

The Earl of Hertford shall be the King's Lieutenant-General of the new army to be sent to France, the Marquis of Dorset shall be Captain of the Foreward, and the Earl of Surrey, who is yet Captain of Boulogne, shall lead the Rearward.<sup>11</sup>

This new army, however, was not sent to France immediately. Surrey remained in command at Boulogne, apparently with the King's confidence in him unimpaired, and continued by sortie and foray to frustrate the efforts of the French to complete fortifications which would dominate the environs of the city. On 9 March he could report to the Privy Council that another French force had been driven to retire to within a league of Montreuil and that Boulogne was in excellent condition.<sup>12</sup> At the same time Surrey mentioned in a dispatch to Lord Cobham at Calais that the King had sent for Mr. Rochester to come to Dover to discuss his Lieutenant-General's further plans for the defense of Boulogne.<sup>13</sup> The prospect that larger military activities would soon be undertaken put Surrey in high spirits.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 9; printed by Nott, p. 224; for date, cf. *S. P.*, *Henry VIII*, XI, v, 1315 (p. 57, note 2); *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 248.

<sup>10</sup> It will be remembered that in 1544 the Duke of Norfolk commanded the part of the English army on the Continent which was designated the Vanguard, while the Rearward was commanded by Lord Russell.

<sup>11</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 272.

<sup>12</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 16; printed by Nott, p. 217.

<sup>13</sup> B.M., Harleian MS. No. 283, fol. 359; printed by Nott, p. 219.

<sup>14</sup> Bapst, p. 332 ff., maintains that the defeat of 7 January was very discouraging to Surrey and destroyed his spirit. It would seem that he has misinterpreted his

iv. In the midst of the military activity at Boulogne Surrey had not ceased to think of his family. Especially did he long to have his wife with him. Shortly after he had become commander of Boulogne he had requested that the Countess of Surrey be permitted to join him there. As his request was refused, Surrey possibly wrote his sonnet beginning "The fansy which that I haue serued long"<sup>15</sup> to tell his wife of his disappointment. And perhaps we can, as well, assign to this time "O happy dames, that may embrace,"<sup>16</sup> which the poet seems to have written for his wife.

In February, 1546, Surrey renewed his suit to the King for permission to bring his wife and family to Boulogne. Again his request was refused, the reason given being that the King "thinketh [it] not best now that time of service (which will bring some trouble and disquietness unmeet for women's imbecilities) approacheth, that your Lordship should send for my Lady your wife."<sup>17</sup> Surrey was greatly disappointed. His love for his wife was deep and steadfast. Longing to have his Countess with him, he probably at this time assured her of his love for her and his confidence in her love for him by writing *Lady Surrey's Lament for Her Absent Lord*,<sup>18</sup> which begins

Good Ladies, ye that haue your pleasures in exile,  
Step in your foote, come take a place, and moorne with me awhile.

Surrey's poems to his wife, this last one especially, contain a note of truer feeling, a note which is lacking in his other love poems. Heretofore Surrey wrote poetry of love merely as a literary exercise. During this period, proclaimed love was conventionally abstract, unattached to the physical being of woman. In England lingered the tradition of chivalric love—the tradition that true love was exemplified by a knight's wearing the token of his lady while defending her beauty in the tourney. The only recompense which man could expect to receive for his feats of arms in his lady's behalf was a smile.

---

evidence in reaching such a conclusion, for Surrey's activities, which continued until the end of March, are in direct contradiction to such a belief.

<sup>15</sup> Arber, p. 32.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>17</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 15; printed by Nott, p. 214.

<sup>18</sup> Title used by Padelford, p. 87; but cf. the title in Arber, p. 19.

From Italy Surrey had learned the Petrarchan convention that man's love is heated by the coldness of his lady: hence, the poet must chose as the object of his love poems a lady whose love he can never attain. Under the influence of these conventions, Surrey was writing about love, not versifying his own passion. Probably he intended his poems to his wife to be simply panegyrics similar to his other love poems, but the reader has little difficulty in convincing himself that he finds in them an underlying note of true feeling.

v. With the approach of the spring of 1546 the King thought to enlarge his military activities on the Continent. He gave the matter much of his attention, but he was slow to make definite plans. On 8 March he ordered his secretary, Paget, to draw up the following letter to Surrey:

My Very Good Lord:

With most hearty commendations; it may like you to understand that I have received your several letters and have showed to his Majesty the contents of them.

For answer to your questions, his Majesty hath willed me to signify to your Lordship that, as touching the entertainment at Boulogne of the Captains and their Lieutenants whose men have been taken from them, his Highness thinketh that considering they serve without having any command, they ought to be content with the wages which his Highness offereth. If they be but content now, they may, as occasion shall rise and places fall void, be from time to time advanced further according to their merits.

And whereas your Lordship doubteth which of these Captains and Lieutenants shall be with your Lordship and which with my Lord of Hertford: albeit it was written that such as were licensed by your Lordship to come over hither for their affairs should return to that side again with my Lord of Hertford to serve under him, and that the rest being at Boulogne should remain with your Lordship. Yet, because it is uncertain to his Majesty which of them be here in England, and which there, his Highness mindeth that all who have departed should return to be there with your Lordship. They will thus be at Boulogne so that my Lord of Hertford, at his coming over, can appoint such of them as shall be thought meetest to occupy the places of rule which be, or shall be void.

As for your diet this Lent time, his Majesty permitteth to your Lordship full liberty. . . .

As for money, I have sent for Mr. Godolphin this morning. He, if he be not already gone, shall bring some money over with him for the relief of your men there. And as for men for the garrison of the Old Man, it is now in devising whether you shall have them from hence, . . . or from Guines. But shortly you shall have them and the money also. If Mr. Godolphin for this time be gone, the money shall be sent immediately by another.

As concerning my Lord Grey's offer of wages and the allurements from thence unto him of the soldiers at Boulogne; His Majesty thinketh that your Lordship hath been amiss informed. My Lord Grey is appointed to take no men that we know of here, nor to levy any new bands. That my Lord Grey would say that he had charge to levy new bands, I do not believe (whatsoever untrue reports which any man doth tell your Lordship in trying by sinister means to set your two lordships at variance—to the continual torment, if it so be, of yourselves and the dangerous hinderance of his Majesty's affairs). True it is now that Francisco Agello (whom your Lordship did recommend to his Majesty for his experience of leading footmen . . . ) made suit to serve under my Lord of Hertford (at his Lordship's going over) with four hundred Italians, and he received grant of two hundred. Likewise was Amerigo Ansemori granted two hundred and his Majesty's old approved servant Typerio had a grant of one hundred. As these Italians are to fight in the field, it is therefore thought unmeet that they should be under the charge of Salerno, whom his Majesty appointeth to the guard of his town under your Lordship. But of any other new bands, we know not here. Nor do we have in mind that those said Captains should take any soldiers from Boulogne. To stay any such attempts, it was written twice by myself to Calais and Guines, more than ten days ago, that his Majesty would have proclaimed: Whatsoever Captain now newly appointed to levy bands of Italians shall admit wittingly any soldier who is already under any Captain, the new Captain shall be committed to ward and discharged of his Majesty's service; also the soldier so admitted shall be committed to ward, loss of a month's wages, and discharged. This proclamation is thought sufficient for that matter.

As for Salerno's desire to be Colonel-General of the Italians: His Majesty meaneth him to have charge of all Italians at Bou-

logne in garrison there. But more than that, he can not conveniently be permitted. Indeed (to tell it to your Lordship to be kept from him), divers of the Italians (of whom some have been Colonels and some Captains) would not serve under him who never was a Colonel before, and who before this time (as they say) had scarcely the charge of a Captain at any time. But this matter your Lordship may with wisdom stay well enough.

As touching the fortifications and Rogers: His Majesty sayeth that at the beginning indeed he appointed your Lordship, Sir Thomas Palmer, and Rogers to the order thereof. But since (upon further consideration of the uncertainty of your opinions touching that matter—both of your Lordship and of Sir Thomas Palmer liking now one thing, and another time misliking the same) his Majesty in debating with Rogers (whom he taketh for a man of skill in fortification) for the perfection of the fortifications of Boulogne hath conceived certain plats which he hath delivered unto the said Rogers and committed unto him the execution of the same. His Majesty, therefore, requires both your Lordship and Mr. Palmer to permit the order thereof to Rogers, who is fully instructed of his Majesty's mind in that behalf. Nevertheless, if you perceive any thing in the work which you think to be dangerous, his Majesty requires you to advertise his Highness of your opinions therein and your consideration in that behalf. Holding such high opinion of both your Lordship and the said Sir Thomas Palmer, we know that neither of you will for this cause, or any other thing tending to the advancement of his Majesty's service or profit, bear the worse will to the said Rogers, but rather you will favor him and support him accordingly. Your Lordship knoweth the man is plain and blunt, but such things must be borne withall as long as he is well meaning and mindeth the service of the King's Majesty. Such further service your Lordship will accordingly tendereth, I doubt not.

And now having answered to all your things, I take my leave of you, praying God to send you to do no worse than I do wish you. From Greenwich, 8 March, at dinner time, 1546.<sup>19</sup>

The tone of Paget's letter shows that the King still looked with some favor upon his commander at Boulogne. Surrey's work there was being carried forward successfully, but he had become wary. Knowing that the Privy Council would seek to

<sup>19</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 15; printed by Nott, p. 214.

stay any definite plans of added fortifications which he recommended himself, Surrey had sent varying suggestions. When Rogers was called to England for a consultation with the King, Surrey was apparently unfriendly towards him. Surrey's enemies in the Privy Council, hoping to provoke him into some indiscretion, urged the King to forward the new fortification which should be put in charge of Rogers. But Surrey was not angered; rather, he was pleased to know that definite work for the strengthening of Boulogne was to be undertaken. For the safety of his command, however, he did feel that some changes in the new plats were necessary.

Having gained another victory over the French on 15 March, he suggested to Paget those defects in the plats which Rogers had brought:

It may like you to understand that I have received your letters of the thirteenth of this present, wherein you require to know our numbers and what supplement of men of war we desire. Wherein I cannot speak unless I touch Rogers's charge: that is to say, I can not know the number of men required to defend the various fortresses without knowing the final strength of the defenses which are to be built.

At such time as there was hope of the reforming of the Castle Brays,<sup>20</sup> (at the first reducing of the Base Town into a citadel, when it was concluded to finish the Young Man<sup>21</sup> to furnish protection over the landing of victuals) there was a plat devised by me and penned by Mr. Southwell for the winter garrison in such season as the enemy could not keep the field. This was designed by me to the intent that his Majesty's charges might be alleviated and the victual spared until the weather should be better—at which time it was thought his Majesty would resolve with what numbers his pieces might then be defended. According to the said plat and by the authority of our commission, I and Mr. Southwell did in the month of January (for sooner we could not discharge the rest

<sup>20</sup> "The Castle Brays seem to have been some advanced part of the works of the castle, probably like the barbican commanding the entrance. In Cotgrave the word is noted thus: 'Faulse Braye. A false-bray or outwall in a fortress'"; Nott, p. 220.

<sup>21</sup> "The Young Man" was a small fortress between the Old Man and the lower (or Base) part of Boulogne. It was built to ensure the English line of communication between the town and the outlying fortresses and to protect the ships that came into the harbor to unload supplies.

of the men for lack of money) established in the High Town and Castle five ensigns of three hundred men apiece (whereof four were ordinary and one extraordinary). In the Citadel of the Lower Town we established three ensigns. And in the Old Man were also placed three ensigns, which could never yet amount unto the number of five hundred—not for lack of men (for many come over hither daily) but for lack of lodging. To overcome this lack, I have good witness how often I have desired the help of Rogers, who hath the only charge of all his Majesty's fortifications, works, and reparations here. Yet nothing is redressed, save that the expectations of the summer maketh the soldiers the better content themselves with their misery. And for the extraordinary ensign within the High Town, it was reserved upon the authority of a letter that I have to show from my Lords of the Council that I should discharge no able men (foreigners or English), but keep them in order to furnish the Castle Brays (yet unfinished) and to supply the wants of the Old Man (albeit the fortress were not able to lodge them) for any sudden attempt against the enemy, as occasion should serve.

And now, Mr. Secretary, being one that neither dare keep silent nor meddle in those things that are excluded out of my charge, yet I can no less in discharge of my duty than to revoke my approval from the whole plat of this garrison formerly devised by me. I do this considering that the Young Man is condemned and in place thereof is devised another work of more travail and cost and (as it seemeth to me) of more danger and less defense. Most humbly I now refer unto his Majesty what numbers shall suffice for the surety of the pieces in all seasons, for I durst not take upon myself to speak of the summer garrison, and the fortifications being now altered, I can not think the winter garrison which I devised is now suitable. Beseeching you to think that if the zeal that I bear to his Majesty's service did not touch me so near, I would be loth to speak like an ignorant fool in things that are before weighed and considered by men of more experience.

And for the old Lower Town, methinketh it were good that his Majesty resolved whether the same should be kept, or razed. As I told my Lord of Hertford and my Lord Admiral, if it is to be kept, additional forces should be lodged there, for as the foreign soldiers that now only lodge in the same are so few, they are rather a prey to provoke the enemy and to put the citadel in danger than a source of surety for the same citadel. If it is to be razed, then there

is to be considered by his Majesty whether the citadel may stand by itself, and if so, when the foreign soldiers are to be discharged. I desired Rogers also at his last being with His Majesty to move his Highness for a trench to be drawn from the Town Guyet<sup>22</sup> to the bulwark of the citadel next the town, so as to reduce the old Lower Town into a less room, for so few men cannot suffice to keep the whole. For answer whereunto Rogers declared to me at his return that, albeit his Majesty's pleasure was the foreign troops should be lodged there, there should yet be no such trench drawn.

And now touching Base Boulogne: I have not only declared my fantasy but also the mind of Mr. Wyatt (whom next to me the matter importeth most) as it shall appear by his letters sent unto you. And in his letters you shall receive the whole numbers of the garrison of this town, which it shall please his Majesty to supply as soon and such sort as his Highness shall think good. Mistrusting not but that his Highness will most prudently considereth that it were not meet that the state of this Jewel<sup>23</sup> should depend upon the success of any other enterprise; trusting rather that his Highness thinketh that his town here should be furnished of men and victuals for its own defense. To form judgment therein, (however time, the enemy, and the visitation of God may waste) the year past may serve you for a precedent. I beseech you to consider that his Majesty's army at Ambleteuse (which I hear of only by Rogers), being six miles distant from us and divided by two rivers, can hardly prevent a puissant enemy (that hath his country at his back) from following such attempts as he hath determined against his Majesty's town of Boulogne. And if (as I hear) the enemy begin now to assemble his army to fortify at Étaples, it is likely that he mindeth to lose nothing by prevention, for I assure you that by the information which I have been able to gather by all intelligences, the enemy mindeth this year to show all his power.

This day we had with them of the French fortress a great skirmish (if I may call it so, although it was rather a charge). I had opportunity to see that the Frenchmen can run as fast away up the hill as the Englishmen not long ago ran down. The leaders of the footmen were Salerno and Captain Arden, whose wise and hearty service (with the circumstance of the rest) I refer to the

<sup>22</sup> "Guyet seems to mean a public place of passage. It is the same word, I apprehend, as gate"; Nott, p. 222.

<sup>23</sup> Boulogne.



credit of this bearer, Sir Andrew Flammock. Beseeching you that the two Colonels may, to encourage them, receive their thanks accordingly. At the writing hereof, I take occasion to wish that when you were here and desired to see a skirmish, I could have showed you the like of this day's encounter.

There was taken by the enemy a vessel laden with spades and shovels, but all the pioneers embarked are arrived here safely, albeit without any letter of direction.

Salerno most humbly contenteth himself with his Majesty's order. He desireth only his Majesty's letters to recover such soldiers as are embezzled hence by the new Captains.

I rejoyce with you the taking of Courteney. In the grace that God hath given our Master, never yet attempt of treason against his Royal Person took effect.

Finally, I recommend unto you poor Sir Andrew Flammock. His service, as I observe in the town and field, hath been always of such sort as me thinketh he that well deserved to be defended from poverty now in his old days. . . .

And thus wishing you that which your gentle heart most desireth, I bid you heartily well to fare. From Boulogne, 15 March, 1546.

Your assured loving friend,  
H. Surrey.<sup>24</sup>

In this letter are indications that Surrey's command at Boulogne was not without difficulties, but there is no hint that he thought his position insecure. Nor did he receive any warning from the following letter, which the Privy Council addressed to him on 21 March:

After our right hearty commendations:

The King's Majesty (having well considered such letters touching the fortifications of Boulogne as have been written from thence, and also such information as hath been given unto his Highness by mouth here by your Lordship)<sup>25</sup> has noted some danger to be thought imminent by you in works appointed to be done at Boulogne. Considering that you can not be so well able by writing to express your minds in those matters to the understanding of his Majesty as if you were here present to say, and to hear again what can be said, in that behalf, his Highness hath

<sup>24</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 18; printed by Nott, p. 220.

<sup>25</sup> See above, Ch. VII, note 35, p. 146.

thought most convenient to require your Lordship to confer immediately thereupon with such as your Lordship supposeth hath best knowledge therein, and then forthwith to repair yourself hither in diligence to make report of your and their opinions in the same.

For the time of your absence, your Lordship is required to leave the chief charge of directing all things within the places under your rule unto the Marshall.

This charge, Mr. Marshall, his Majesty prayeth you to take especially upon yourself and in all your doings and proceedings to use the advice of the rest of his Highness's Council there. And because our very good Lord, the Earl of Hertford (who repaireth over at this present with his Majesty's army), is appointed to be his Highness's Lieutenant-General in all places on that side, His Highness requireth you, Mr. Marshall, and all you who are the rest of the Council there, to be unto the said Earl obeying, aiding, and assisting in all things concerning the execution of his said office accordingly. And for as much as his Majesty hath now of fresh advertisements again of treasons that are conspired (especially touching the victuals and munitions of the pieces there), his Majesty prayeth you all to have a marvelous diligent regard thereto, and every one of you in special to look to his particular charge so as no traitorous enterprise be unforeseen from which should ensue any danger to any of His Highness's said pieces.

And whereas we signified unto you by our letters yesterday that his Majesty (minding to employ Sir Andrew Flammock on his Highness's service on this side the seas) hath appointed you, Sir Richard Wyndebank, to be Knight Porter of the High Town of Boulogne, the office of Under-Marshall is now void. Whereby, his Majesty (considering the good service which Mr. Croft hath been lately recommended by you all to have done unto his Highness, and upon hope of continuance of his good endeavor to serve his Majesty well) hath ordained Mr. Croft to be Under-Marshall. We pray you to give order for the placing of him therein accordingly.<sup>26</sup>

Surrey was recalled to England, but there is a great deal of confusion as to his position when he arrived. Such appointments as the letter mentions had been suggested by Surrey; that is, he had recommended both Mr. Croft and Sir Andrew

<sup>26</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 21; printed by Nott, p. 227; dated *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 433.

Flammock for promotion. That Surrey's wishes were followed in the matter is strong evidence that he was not under the King's personal displeasure.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, the Privy Council states here that Surrey is recalled for a conference with the King about conditions at Boulogne, intimating clearly that Surrey is to be returned to his command. Perhaps the Privy Council was using this method to bring about Surrey's recall to forward some scheme for discrediting him, but the possibility becomes evident only later. The letter itself implicates Surrey in no way in the "fresh advertisements of treasons that are conspired," for men he recommended were being advanced to forestall such misadventures.

Having ordered Surrey, on 21 March, to hasten to England immediately, the next day the Privy Council wrote to direct Surrey to execute some further orders before starting. The tone of this letter is ominous:

After our most hearty commendations unto your good Lordship:

These shall be to advertise you that the King's Majesty, having most gravely considered the state of all his Highness's pieces under your rule, hath finally resolved to have only such numbers to remain in every one of the said pieces as shall appear unto you by a Schedule here enclosed. With this order, his Majesty commanded us to signify unto you that if you have at this present any greater numbers of men than shall suffice for the furniture of the said pieces according to his Majesty's pleasure, you may at your next pay-day discharge so many of the weakest and worst men as shall be found there above the said numbers. For the payment of which number then to be discharged, his Majesty requireth you to take order there accordingly. Or if you shall want money for the payment of the same, you shall signify hither with speed what shall be wanted for that purpose, to the intent money may be sent from hence for discharge of the same. And if upon consideration of your numbers you shall find that you want money to furnish every place according to his Majesty's appointment, his Majesty's pleasure is that you shall in writing advertise Hilson with speed what money you shall want for the furniture of every of the said pieces. In the mean time sort your men in every of them, notably having respect to his resolution.

<sup>27</sup> This evidence is noted by Nott, p. 229.

Your Lordship shall also understand that his Highness is advertised that (notwithstanding the often and earnest signification of his Majesty's pleasure to the contrary) there be remaining there an excessive number of women and children. Because (besides many other inconveniences) their being there is a great waste of his Majesty's victuals, his Highness hath commanded us forthwith to require you not only to take order for the sending away and discharge of them that be now there, but also you shall so provide that from henceforth no women (especially of the light sort) be permitted to repair thither or to remain there. Whereunto his Majesty requireth you to have earnest regard.

To signify further unto you: as his Majesty is resolved to have the number only of five thousand to remain there, his Highness's pleasure is that Colonel Salerno, with his band of Italians, which we take to be about the number of seven hundred, shall repair to the camp of my Lord of Hertford, from whom we doubt not but you shall be shortly more fully advertised touching that matter.<sup>28</sup>

Having done what he could in a very short time to carry out these orders, Surrey returned to England. The manner in which he was received is not clear. A letter of 28 March, 1546, contains the comment, "The Earl of Surrey, formerly captain of Boulogne, arrived at Court yesterday, but was coldly received and did not see the King. His father, the Duke of Norfolk, is absent from the Court."<sup>29</sup> The apparent meaning of this comment, however, is questionable. As Surrey was still Captain of Boulogne on 28 March, there is at least one misstatement in the comment. That Surrey failed to see the King promptly upon his arrival implies nothing. Henry VIII made a practice of delaying to grant audiences, even to men high in his favor or to high dignitaries of foreign courts. It was an example of his increasing arrogance. In the letter the phrase that Surrey "was coldly received" is not elucidated. It may refer to the attitude of the Privy Council, which—especially in the absence of the Duke of Norfolk—was dominated by the adherents of Surrey's enemy, the Earl of Hertford. Nevertheless, the Privy Council had only recently acted upon Surrey's recommendations to advance men at Boulogne. Moreover, no

<sup>28</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 23; printed by Nott, p. 175; dated by *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 438.

<sup>29</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 479.

hint that Surrey had lost favor had reached the King's Council of Boulogne, which continued to express confidence that Surrey would be able to present the state of things there in a favorable light.<sup>30</sup>

The meaning of the Privy Council's action on 30 March is also open to doubt. The Privy Council records show that on that date the Earl of Surrey was "revoked . . . from his late charge at Boloigne, entending to employ his service other-ways."<sup>31</sup> This might mean that Surrey, not wishing to tarry within the walls of Boulogne when an opportunity for more active service presented, had successfully followed Paget's advice to apply to the King for a command in the new army which was now being sent to the Continent. A month earlier Paget had stated as a determined fact that the Earl of Surrey was to lead the Rearguard of this army. Whatever the true reason that he was removed from his command of Boulogne, certain it is that Surrey was not in disgrace at the time, for on the same day Paget wrote, "It is supposed that my lord of Surrey shall within a day or two repair thither [to Boulogne] . . . for the ordering of his things there."<sup>32</sup> His accounts at Boulogne were still open.

vi. Surrey did not, however, return to Boulogne even for a short time. Why he did not is unknown. Nevertheless, some light may be thrown on the matter by the fact that Lord Grey of Wilton had again been appointed to command there. Although Lord Grey's commission was not signed until 9 April,<sup>33</sup> the Privy Council had written to him on 30 March to notify him of this appointment.<sup>34</sup> Surrey had tried to be friendly towards Lord Grey during the earlier part of his command at Boulogne, but Lord Grey would not have it so. Probably he resented his removal from Boulogne in September, 1545, in order that Surrey might be given command there.<sup>35</sup> While Surrey was the King's Lieutenant-General on the Continent, Grey was forced, however unwillingly, to obey Surrey's military commands and

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 481.

<sup>31</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, I, 364.

<sup>32</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 488.

<sup>33</sup> Rymer's *Foedera*, XV, 90.

<sup>34</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, I, 364.

<sup>35</sup> Bapst, p. 322, declares this to be fact, but we have no evidence of trouble between Grey and Surrey previous to February, 1546.

could not openly undertake hostile action against him. Surrey's enemies may have seized upon Grey's resentment and fanned it into flame. By March there was an open breach between Grey and Surrey. Encouraged by the Earl of Hertford, Lord Grey had begun to do his utmost to annoy his commander. He delayed to obey Surrey's orders as long as possible, and with Hertford's aid, he caused Captains recently appointed to enlist new companies to entice men from Surrey's garrison at Boulogne. Although Paget did write to Surrey on 8 March<sup>36</sup> blaming a third party for attempting to set Grey and Surrey at variance—to the detriment of the King's affairs and the advancement of Hertford's schemes for Surrey's downfall—Paget was unable to allay the quarrel. The first of April, 1546, as soon as Lord Grey returned to Boulogne he showed openly his bitterness against Surrey. He discharged every man he could that Surrey had appointed to office and began to make statements that he found Surrey had misused his command there. To these accusations Surrey wrote a rebuttal in a most vigorous and characteristic style:

To the Right Worshipful Sir William Paget, Kt.,  
One of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries:

... Coming from Boulogne in such sort as you know, I left behind me only two of my servants, John Rosington and Thomas Copeland. To the said John, for his notable service, I gave the advantage of the play in Boulogne. To Thomas I gave the prefect of the passage. Both of these men my Lord Grey put immediately out of service after my departure, notwithstanding the letter I obtained from you to him in their favor. Upon a better consideration, John was permitted to occupy his office. But my Lord Grey, to his own benefit, continueth to occupy the other's office of the passage, saying that I and my predecessors at Boulogne did use that office to our own gain (which I assure you is untrue) and that this office should be a parcel of the income of the Deputy. In Calais this office was never so used. Furthermore, it seemeth to me that this office furnisheth too little revenues for a Deputy to concern himself with grasping, unless it were for some displeasure borne me.

<sup>36</sup> P.R.O., Fr. Corres., VI, 15; quoted above, p. 165.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, this is the only suit that I have made to you for anything touching Boulogne since my departure. Wherefore, may it please you, if My Lord Grey will needs be perfect of the passage although that office was worth no less than fifty pounds a year to the said Thomas (who was placed in that office by a King's Lieutenant—and methinketh it a great disorder that a Captain of Boulogne should displace for his own private gain an officer placed by a King's Lieutenant) I trust at least it may please you to request my Lord Grey to recompense him with a sum of money in recompense of that which he hath lost, for the said Thomas deserves this office as he purchased the right to it so dearly with so many dangers to his life. At your requiring him to do so, me thinketh my Lord Grey of his liberality cannot refrain to do this.

And for answer that my said Lord chargeth me to have turned the same office to my private profit: in his saying so he can have no honor, for there be in Boulogne too many witnesses that Henry of Surrey was never for singular profit corrupted, nor never yet bribe closed his hand. This lesson I learned of my father, and I wish to succeed him therein as in the rest of his virtues.

Further, whereas the said Copeland was placed there for his merits of the guard by Mr. Southwell and me, and whereas my said Lord Grey detaineth from him his wages, may it please you, at my hearty request, to grant him your letters for the obtaining his wages and the rest of his just deserves. And may it please you to pardon my frankness, as you know it is my nature to use frankness with such as I do hold my friends. And thus wishing you to continue ever more my friend, till I deserve by any fault of mine the contrary, I pray God to send you whatever good your own heart desireth . . . 14 July, 1546.

Your assured loving friend,  
H. Surrey.<sup>37</sup>

vii. The legend that Surrey was thrown in prison immediately after he returned to England from Boulogne can no longer be believed,<sup>38</sup> for he was not in disgrace when he was

<sup>37</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Titus B. II, fol. 58; printed by Nott, p. 229.

<sup>38</sup> This belief was advanced by Nott, p. lxxxvii ff., in 1815 and was widely accepted. To substantiate this statement Nott cited a letter written by the Duke of Norfolk to thank the King for informing him of "my foolish son's demeanor"; but as Bapst, p. 337, has pointed out, this letter does not refer to Surrey, but to the Duke's second son, Lord Thomas Howard.

recalled from Boulogne. The strongest of evidence to the contrary exists. On 7 April, 1546, Surrey received from the King a grant, in fee, for his services, of the reversion and rent of 11 pounds, 9 shillings, 6 pence reserved upon the house and site and certain demesne lands of Wymondham monastery, Norfolk; also the grant of the said house and lands and all the possessions of the said monastery in Wymondham except the rectory and advowson of the vicarage of Wymondham.<sup>39</sup>

Moreover, on 16 May following, he was commissioned "to assess a loving contribution to be given by the King's subjects of the county of Norfolk."<sup>40</sup> If Surrey's enemies had destroyed the King's confidence in him to such an extent that he was banished from the Court, or if Surrey had offended the King to such a degree that he was imprisoned, Henry VIII would not have been bestowing favors.

viii. The Duke of Norfolk's opposition to the continuance of the war against France suggests that he may have been responsible for Surrey's failure to return to the Continent. Although conclusive evidence is lacking, possibly the enigma can be explained in this way: Two days after Surrey arrived in London the King granted him a most gracious audience. His Majesty questioned Surrey at length about the fortifications at Boulogne and deigned to find Surrey's answers pleasing. As his Highness seemed to be so friendly, Surrey decided to act upon Paget's advice to "sue to his Majesty for a place of service in the field." Receiving Surrey's suit as declaring his willingness to serve, the King replied that his Privy Council should try to find a suitable office for him in the new army. In consequence, on 30 March the Privy Council revoked Surrey from Boulogne for other service. But the Duke of Norfolk returned to the Court that day to prevent Surrey from receiving an office in the new army. He was convinced that a peace would soon be concluded with France and that those who encouraged the King to larger military activities on the Continent would "at length get small thanks." Moreover, he was suspicious of

<sup>39</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 716 (9).

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 970 (31 & 32).



the sudden graciousness of the Privy Council toward giving Surrey a command in the new army. The Earl of Hertford was the King's Lieutenant-General; if Surrey did return to the Continent he would have to serve under Hertford's command. The Duke thought he saw why the Hertford faction of the Privy Council was so willing that Surrey's suit should be granted. With Surrey as his subordinate, if Hertford could not provoke his rival into some ill-considered act, he could by trickery entangle him in some military encounter which would be to his discredit. Although Norfolk had to use all his influence to thwart this scheme, Surrey was not sent to the Continent. However unwillingly, he was persuaded to escape for the time being from the intrigues of the Court and to leave London.

Once on his way to Norfolk, Surrey doubtless hurried to rejoin his wife, from whom he had been so long separated. Throughout April and May he stayed mostly at Surrey House, enjoying his newly furnished home with his family. There he probably endeavored after his long absence to set his affairs to rights, hunted occasionally, perhaps gave a few hours to teaching his young sons the use of arms. His efforts to straighten out his personal finances led him at least once to Court, where he obtained two grants from the King, but for the most part he remained in Norfolk until June, when the wisdom of his father's course relating to Boulogne was demonstrated. On the seventh of that month was signed a treaty of peace between England and France which specified that Boulogne was to be returned to France upon the condition that France within ten years should pay a heavy indemnity to England; until the payment was made England should remain in possession of Boulogne.

**ix.** While Surrey remained in the north the Duke of Norfolk sought some means of allaying the animosity between his eldest son and the Earl of Hertford. As Hertford was the uncle of Prince Edward, the Duke could see no hope of destroying his influence with the King and again set himself the task of conciliating the hostility which he feared might bring the Howards to ruin. For this purpose he turned to the possibilities

of making an advantageous matrimonial alliance—a method which had served the Howards well in the past—and took up again his former project of marrying his daughter, the Duchess of Richmond, to Sir Thomas Seymour. To eradicate any possibility of continued hostility between the Seymours and the Howards, the Duke also proposed to marry three of his grandchildren (two of Surrey's children and one child of Lord Thomas) to three children of the Earl of Hertford.<sup>41</sup> On 10 June, 1546, he suggested these four marriages to the King, hoping that by obtaining his Majesty's sanction the marriages could be concluded.

The Duke of Norfolk's proposal found favor in the King's eyes. But not in Surrey's! He had no knowledge of this proposal when he returned to the Court to attend the Feast of St. George.<sup>42</sup> Nor was he upon his arrival informed of his father's plan. Such evidence as we have forces us to conjecture<sup>43</sup> that court gossip first gave him knowledge of the intended matrimonial alliances and caused him to declare openly that never while he lived should a child of his marry a Seymour. Such compromises—any compromise with the “new men,” who were more and more openly usurping rights belonging only to England's peers—would lead inevitably to the destruction of the true nobility. The only possible result would be to increase the arrogance of the upstarts and to give them added opportunity to pull down and destroy their betters.

Immediately after denying the rumor, we conjecture, Surrey went in search of his father to demand if gossip truly reported that he had made such a proposal. In an anteroom of the palace he encountered his sister, the Duchess of Richmond. Although there were a number of people about, he began to

<sup>41</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Titus B.I, fol. 94; printed by Nott, appx. XXXVIII; also Bapst, p. 338 ff.; Lord Herbert, p. 563, where Surrey's name is mistakenly printed instead of that of his son.

<sup>42</sup> At the ceremonies of the Order of the Garter held on 3 May, 1546, neither Surrey nor the King was present, but as no record of his absence was made from the celebration of the Feast of St. George, held this year on 6 June, we may infer that he attended; see *Garter*, II, 435-437.

<sup>43</sup> The following conjectural account is offered to explain statements in the depositions taken against Surrey in December, 1546; see *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 555, and Lord Herbert, p. 562 ff.; also cf. Bapst, p. 338 ff.

question her. When she admitted that such marriages had been proposed, Surrey demanded to know her feelings in the matter. She hesitated to make a definite answer but finally said coquettishly<sup>44</sup> that she was considering the King's suggestion that she marry Sir Thomas Seymour. Her manner and her words provoked Surrey into exclaiming, "Go to! Such would be a grand farce of a marriage."

Disdaining a mere brother's advice, she turned away. Her attitude aroused Surrey's temper still further, and in tones of bitter scorn, which could be heard all over the room, he added:

You had best conclude your marriage quickly, while your husband-to-be is in such high favor. Then you can profit from your position to insinuate yourself into the good graces of the King. If you can submit yourself to such a husband, why not make the most of your chance. You should become the Royal Mistress and play the part in England that is held in France by the Duchess d'Étampes.<sup>45</sup>

By this date Henry VIII's body had become too corpulent and diseased for him to be interested in mistresses, but the Duchess of Richmond, if she had been dreaming of the power and influence which she might gain by marriage, must have been deeply humiliated by such bitter irony, publicly expressed. Although Surrey's point was made so forcibly that she changed her mind about becoming the wife of Sir Thomas Seymour, she doubtless conceived the resentment against her brother which led her to testify against him when he was on trial for his life.

As for the Duke of Norfolk, he was vexed by Surrey's intervention, which entirely ruined his projected conciliation of the Seymours. In no uncertain terms he reprimanded his son, declaring that by his unbending attitude towards Hertford and the "new men" he would lose everything—position, power, and money—that he, the Duke, had by untiring effort and

<sup>44</sup> The Duchess of Richmond was at the time reputed to be a coquette; cf. *Bapst*, p. 339.

<sup>45</sup> Anne de Pisseleu, Duchess d'Étampes, was the mistress of Francis I and as such had a great influence in French affairs. The words quoted here are almost verbatim from *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 555 (4 & 5).

careful diplomacy regained for the Howards. In a few weeks, however, his anger cooled and normal relations were reëstablished between the Duke and his eldest son.

x. Surrey's words to his sister, which we think were spoken ironically, did not arouse the King's ire. His influence unabated, Surrey remained at the Court almost continuously until the last of August. The Privy Council followed his advice concerning a payment to Sir Henry Palmer, who had been Master of the Ordnance at Boulogne.<sup>46</sup> As he never neglected a man who had served him well or forgot an enemy who had served him ill, during July he also sought and obtained redress for wrongs which two men whom he had left at Boulogne had suffered at the hand of Lord Grey.<sup>47</sup>

Surrey's consideration for others was tested in another way at this time. In July he was given the task of discharging the foreign mercenaries whom Henry VIII had been employing. This he accomplished to the satisfaction of all, but to his own cost. As he reported the matter to Paget on 14 July,

Whereas yesternight I was advertised by you that the King's Majesty thinketh his liberality sufficiently extended towards the foreigners that have served him, I have accordingly, but unsuccessfully, done my best to satisfy them with fair words. Assuring you on my faith that their necessity seemed to me such as it cost me a hundred ducats, and something more, of mine own purse. Albeit, now there resteth nothing to be done but their passports and ready dispatch from you, wherein it may please you to consider their great charges here.<sup>48</sup>

xi. Although he was kept busy by his court duties, during the summer Surrey was also attempting to accomplish some purpose of his own which he kept very secret. What it was not even his own contemporaries were able to discover, and his mysteriousness was later used against him by Sir Richard Southwell when the inquiry into Surrey's affairs started in December. Lord Lisle wrote to Paget on 12 July,

<sup>46</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 1397.

<sup>47</sup> *B.M.*, Cotton MS. Titus B. II, fol. 58; printed by Nott, p. 229.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

I send a letter which my Lord of Surrey sent unto my lodgings this morning, wherein is contained so many parables that I do not perfectly understand it. This letter (if you think it meet) I require you to show to the King's Majesty.<sup>49</sup>

Paget evidently thought the contents of the letter were not of sufficient importance to trouble the King, for nothing came of the matter at this time. Shortly thereafter Surrey wrote another letter in which he ordered his servant to deliver the note enclosed to Mrs. Hevingham, and to her only. This letter to Surrey's servant came into the hands of Sir Richard Southwell and he wrote on the back, "Yt ys thowght that menyse secrettes hathe passed betwen them [Surrey and Mrs. Hevingham] before her maryag and sethens."<sup>50</sup> The inquiry in December did not bring any knowledge of the contents of the letter which was to be delivered "to none but her own hands"; nor was any further light thrown on Lisle's letter. Nevertheless, the existence of the two letters makes certain that Surrey was not without his own projects.

xii. Surrey was still in attendance upon the King in August, when the French Ambassadors Extraordinary arrived in England for the formal ratification of the treaty of peace to which Henry and Francis had agreed on 7 June. The Admiral of France and other ambassadors, accompanied by "diurse great Lordes, besyde two hundreth Gentlemen well appointed" were received at Hampton Court on 24 August. During the three days following they were pompously entertained. For this lavish display his Majesty had not only called to the Court all the great lords of the realm, but he had called upon each to bring with him in addition to his usual retinue a certain number of horsemen for the King's special train.

To tel you of the costlye banquet houses that were built, & of the great banquettes, the costly Maskes, the liberal huntynge that were shewed [the French Ambassadors], you woulde much maruel and skant beleue.<sup>51</sup>

The magnificence was such that the very torch bearers were clothed in cloth of gold.

<sup>49</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 1263.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 1426.

<sup>51</sup> Hall, p. 867.

For these ceremonies Surrey was appointed, together with the Duke of Norfolk and Cranmer, to take the most honorable offices. Four persons were selected to provide horses, with footstools, for the French Admiral. These four were the King, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Norfolk, and the Earl of Surrey.<sup>52</sup> In the order of precedence in which the nobility were arranged Surrey was ranked with the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth, a distinction which must have added to his enjoyment of the festivities. Especially, one may surmise, did he enjoy the ceremonial reception of the French Ambassadors. There the peers of England stood in a line for all to see the order of precedence. As Lord High Chamberlain, Surrey's enemy, the Earl of Hertford, was first of the Earls. But Surrey, as the eldest son of a Duke, preceded him. The French Ambassadors, whose countrymen always found Surrey's conduct delightful, sought his company upon every occasion, and while entertaining his guests, the King also showed Surrey every possible mark of favor.

That the King was at this time in sympathy with the schemes of Surrey's enemies to destroy him is impossible. In his later life Henry VIII never bothered to hide his feelings. He showed his anger when he felt it, and he never feigned confidence which he did not have in a subject. Nevertheless, the departure of the French Ambassadors Extraordinary ended the last celebration in which Surrey played an important part which was pleasing to himself.

<sup>52</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Otho. C. XIV; see Nott, p. lxxxix.

## CHAPTER IX

### TO THE EXECUTIONER'S BLOCK

Soon after the French Ambassadors Extraordinary returned to France, Surrey also left the Court. Although still very much in the good graces of the King, he was heavily in debt. Probably his desire to escape the expense of court life occasioned his retirement to Norfolk. There he remained throughout the autumn months. Most of this time he resided at Surrey House, but he often visited his father, who was in residence at Kenninghall. The Duke of Norfolk was seventy-two years old. Anticipating that his eldest son would soon inherit his dukedom, Norfolk probably discussed his affairs at length with Surrey, sought to convince his heir that open antagonism toward Hertford would lead to ruin, and attempted to impart to him some of the diplomacy which had served the old Duke so well.

ii. Pressed by financial difficulties but confident of the King's favor, Surrey's eye fell upon the belfry and dormitory of a former monastery in Norwich. For the grant of these he decided to sue to his Majesty. On 19 October, being then at Kenninghall, Surrey wrote to Paget to obtain his help:

I have viewed the clocher and dorter of Christ Church in Norwich, which is in all things (as I informed you) unserviceable to their church—saving for a memory of the old supersition. [These things would] extend to discharge me out of the misery of debt; and if it were his most excellent Ma[jesty's] pleasure to give it me, I will faithfully promise never to trouble his Ma[jesty] with any suit of profit to myself hereafter. And [I will] spend that and the rest [of my means] in his Ma[jesty's] service with the old zeal that I have served with always.<sup>1</sup>

When he had waited several weeks without receiving a reply from Paget, Surrey did not give up hope. On the contrary, he confidently determined to press his request in person. To this

<sup>1</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 287.

end he returned to the Court about the middle of November.

The King had followed his usual custom of moving, with his Court, from place to place during the autumn. From Westminster he had gone to Hampton Court. Then he had stayed for short times in turn at Oatlands, Woking, Guildford, and Chobham. From Chobham he had gone to Windsor. Returning to London early in November, he had taken up his residence at Whitehall and then moved to Ely place.

When Surrey arrived at the Court he found there an unwonted undercurrent of unrest. He could feel the uncertainty of the officials. They treated him almost rudely one moment and very graciously the next. Rumors of intrigue were unusually strong. As no definite information had been permitted to reach Norfolk of the seriousness of the dangerous fever which had attacked the King while he was at Windsor, Surrey was probably puzzled until he saw his Majesty. One look at his Majesty at Ely place, however, immediately made the situation clear. Henry VIII's ill health was obvious. His diseased leg and corpulent body had become so unwieldy that at times he could neither walk nor stand. Mechanical contrivances had to be used in moving the person of his Royal Highness from room to room and floor to floor. That he could not live much longer was apparent. Prince Edward would soon succeed to the throne. The new King, a child of only nine years, would be but a puppet. "Who should rule?" was the question which was causing the unrest at the Court. The possibilities occupied every mind while every tongue voiced opinions and desires more or less openly. Henry VIII had been steering a middle course. Should the Party of Reform or the Party of Reaction gain control upon Henry VIII's death? Would the Earl of Hertford be Regent? Or would the Duke of Norfolk gain that office, and as Regent control England?

In the midst of such uncertainty Surrey was not one to hide his convictions or hold his tongue. When in his presence anyone questioned who would be Regent during the minority of Prince Edward he declared that there should be no question in the matter. At this time only two men in England could claim the title of duke. The Duke of Norfolk was one. The other



was Henry Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, who had not yet reached his majority. As the Duke of Norfolk was the premier peer of the realm, it was unthinkable that his right should be disregarded while an upstart earl was elevated over his head to the Regency. Led by the Earl of Hertford, who was an unscrupulous scoundrel and could be trusted to consider nothing but his vaulting ambitions, "these new erected men would by their wills leave no noble man on life."<sup>2</sup> Had not Paget and Wriothesley<sup>3</sup> already had to request Hertford to behave in a more suitable manner toward the Duke of Norfolk and others of the old nobility?<sup>4</sup>

Surrey, we conjecture, permitted himself to show anger whenever the subject was mentioned, but he could restrain himself with admirable self-control when the situation demanded. He saw through what seems to have been a deliberate plot to provoke him into again striking a man in the precincts of the Court.<sup>5</sup> The man selected to do the baiting was Sir George Blage, formerly one of Surrey's gentleman servants but now a follower of Hertford and a supporter of the Reformation.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 555 (1).

<sup>3</sup> Sir Thomas Wriothesley (created Baron Wriothesley of Titchfield on 1 January, 1544, and Earl of Southampton on 16 February, 1547) had become Lord Chancellor on 3 May, 1544.

<sup>4</sup> *Burghley State Papers*, S. Haynes, editor, Vol. I (London, 1740), pp. 5 & 7.

<sup>5</sup> The interpretation in the following account is conjectural, but the quotations are drawn from the depositions of Edward Rogers and others which were made in December, 1546 (see *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 555). Although Rogers's depositions contain the statement that this quarrel took place "about a year, or three quarters of a year ago," that date would appear to be a deliberate misstatement. "About a year, or three quarters of a year ago" Surrey was in Boulogne. Moreover, the deposition ends abruptly with the statement, "But what passed further Deponent does not remember." It is not probable that the Deponent would have been able to quote the exact words used by Blage and Surrey, yet fail to remember the conclusion of the quarrel or a more exact date. As the Privy Council was attempting to show that Surrey had been contemplating treasonable acts for some time past, and as Surrey's statements in this quarrel would be more useful to the Council if he had made them when the King was not obviously dying, this quarrel was probably misdated deliberately in the deposition; see especially the second of Sir Edward Warner's depositions (*L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 555 (3)). Surrey was imprisoned in the Lord Chancellor's house early in December "for writing a threatening letter to a gentleman" (*L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 605). This gentleman would appear to have been George Blage, and it is highly improbable that Surrey waited several months after the quarrel to write the threatening letter.

Though his former master had treated Blage very well, he had deserted to the enemy. As Surrey was known to have no toleration whatsoever for false friends, Blage, if anyone, should have been able to incite his anger and provoke him into losing control of his temper.

When in the precincts of the Court, Blage declared in Surrey's hearing that he doubted whether the Duke of Norfolk would be fit governor of Prince Edward, Surrey reacted as anticipated by avowing "that his father was meetest, both for good services and for estates," to be the Regent.

Blage quickly replied, "Then the Prince should be but evil taught."

The young earl, who had been called "the most folish prowde boye. . . in Englande," was able to demonstrate that his temper served him, not he it, by retorting calmly, "It is not so. My father is a man of great honor."

Surrounded by Hertford's adherents and determined to provoke an open quarrel, Blage continued vehemently, "Rather than it should come to pass that the Prince should be under the government of your father or you, I would bide the adventure to thrust this dagger in you."

This threat Surrey treated with utter contempt and only replied, "Ye are very hasty. It is a misadventure that God sent such a shrewd cow short horns."

"Yea, my Lord," quod Blage, "and I trust your horns also shall be kept so short as ye shall not be able to do any hurt with them."

These words led to even more insulting assertions, but Surrey, though inwardly infuriated by the deliberate insults, nevertheless remained in sufficient control of himself to refuse the bait and turned his back on Blage.

But not for long. No one with the blood of Hotspur in his veins could abide such indignities when not restrained by the royal edict which prohibited violence in the vicinity of his Majesty's person. Surrey left Ely Place, but soon afterwards—open and direct in his actions as always—he took sword and dagger to protect himself from possible ambush and went to Blage's lodgings. Luckily or unluckily, the house had a stout

door, which withstood Surrey's efforts to break it down when those inside refused to open it. Then, the force of his anger spent in beating on the door and shouting through it that of late Blage had been very hasty with him and he meant to teach him better ways, the Earl returned to his lodgings. On the way his blood continued to cool, but he grew uncertain that Blage had been behind that stout door to hear his admonitions. To make sure that the knave understood, he took pen and paper, wrote down what the Earl of Surrey would do to him if he were again so presumptuous, and dispatched the letter.

Although Surrey had avoided his enemies' attempts to provoke him into doing violence in the precincts of the Court, the directness of his action and his openness in declaring his mind gave the Privy Council, which at Hertford's instigation was ready to seize even the slightest of excuses, a pretext for taking him into custody. For writing this threatening letter, the exact contents of which we can only surmise, Surrey was placed under arrest in the Lord Chancellor's house.<sup>6</sup> The Earl of Hertford made the most of the situation. Surrey's confinement in the house of the Lord Chancellor led to, or was arranged as a prelude to, an official inquiry into the doings and affairs of both Surrey and his father.

iii. Although Surrey's enemies declared that he was "vain," "arrogant," and "headstrong"—although tradition would have us believe that he was "folish prowde" and stupidly opinionated—his conduct throughout his final imprisonment, trial, and execution, considered in the light of his military and literary accomplishments, argues strongly that such adjectives as "proud," "critical," and "self-confident" would be more appropriate; in addition, his conduct more than suggests that he may have possessed keen insight and been acting with sound judgment. He had been born to high rank, defined rights, and many privileges. Heir to the leadership of the conservative old nobility, he had been trained to accept and to fulfill the responsibilities of his inheritance. Proud of his heritage, he found reason to be proud of conducting himself according to the

<sup>6</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 605.

ancient code of knighthood. The traditions of chivalry commanded: be forgetful of no service rendered, but tolerate no affront; be contemptuous of enemies and danger, but respect those to whom respect is due; be loyal to your principles and true to your friends; brook no compromise with the right; above all else, unto thine own self be true until death. Surrey seems to have taken these precepts literally. Death rather than dishonor—with all the glorious and vainglorious implications of the phrase—was to him a true ethical standard. From the unbending attitude to which this standard committed him sprang both his strength and his weakness.

Numerous causes have been given for Surrey's downfall, but all of these spring from his unwillingness or inability to dissemble. He refused to follow the example of his father, who was always diplomatic when diplomacy was expedient. He would not recognize the increasing power of the Earl of Hertford and openly boasted that "there were some who made no great account of him, but he trusted one day to make them very small";<sup>7</sup> he openly upheld the right of his father to the Regency of Edward VI before the death of Henry VIII; and he asserted his right to bear certain heraldic quarterings in his escutcheon knowing that his enemies were using every possible means to destroy the ailing and irritable King's confidence in him. By refusing to renounce his principles or forego the least of his "rights" in the face of the coincidence of circumstances, Surrey placed in the hands of his enemies the weapons with which to destroy him. Nevertheless, as his father's experience was to show, it is doubtful that he could have during the winter of 1546/47 escaped his enemies even if he had sought the protection of expediency.

iv. As soon as Surrey was arrested the Earl of Hertford acted. In order to protect himself as well as to advance his own ambitions, Hertford had been using the means which he possessed as uncle of Prince Edward to implant in the dying King's mind a fear of the Howards. Henry VIII was no longer able to act or to think for himself—and Hertford had his ear and a

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 533.

stamp with which to affix the royal signature to documents.<sup>8</sup>

The enmity between Hertford and Surrey was a reflection of the changing social order, for in their persons they represented the New and the Old. Consequently, Hertford is scarcely to be blamed for seeking to protect himself against Surrey's animosity for all he represented. But the methods he used to protect himself—as well as the use he made of the power he obtained by these methods—are at least questionable. He gave out that he had discovered a plot of the Duke of Norfolk and his son to "kill all the [Privy] Council and [to] take complete control of the Prince"<sup>9</sup> and of the country before death could claim the body of the King's Majesty. Aroused by this tale, or made indifferent by the lethargy into which he was sinking, Henry VIII ceased to show his wonted favor towards Surrey and his father. Moreover, in his Majesty's name, but most probably by Hertford, word was given out that full impunity would be granted to all who could bring forward or substantiate charges against the Duke of Norfolk or the Earl of Surrey.<sup>10</sup>

When this announcement was made, Sir Richard Southwell was the first to come forward. He had been Surrey's friend from childhood,<sup>11</sup> and while he served under Surrey at Boulogne their friendly relations had continued. Nevertheless, he volunteered that he knew something which touched Surrey's fidelity to the King.<sup>12</sup> In contrast to Surrey's constancy, such acts, either through fear or ambition, were characteristic of the age. Probably Southwell learned that Hertford, having control of the Privy Council, was determined to destroy Surrey without further delay. Under such conditions, he knew that the means would certainly be found. In consequence, fearing that he

<sup>8</sup> Toward the end of 1546, Henry VIII's physical and mental powers were sinking so rapidly that it is impossible to determine whether the "new men" had convinced him that the Howards would after his death attempt to seize Edward VI's throne for themselves (cf. *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 568), or whether the dying King had sunk into such a stupor that the Earl of Hertford was merely stamping the royal signature on documents he himself had prepared; cf. A. F. Pollard, *Hist. of England, 1547-1603* (second impression, London, 1911), pp. 5-6, where he discusses the validity of Henry VIII's will.

<sup>9</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 568 & 547.

<sup>10</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 562.

<sup>11</sup> *L. & P.*, XI, 727.

<sup>12</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 562; *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 533.

might be implicated, he successfully protected himself by deserting his friend and being the first to denounce him. Much of his testimony was merely of suspicious actions, but it was he who suggested the charge for which Surrey was attainted. He testified that Surrey had placed in the first quarter of his heraldic shield the royal arms of England. Surrey's placing the royal arms of England in the first quarter, Southwell declared, signified that Surrey considered himself to have a direct right to the Crown of England.<sup>13</sup> As there was not, however, the slightest discoverable evidence that Surrey had borne the arms of England so, the Privy Council had to drop this charge.<sup>14</sup> But Southwell's second suggestion was of more use to the Council. Surrey had borne in his escutcheon the royal arms ascribed to Edward the Confessor. Although Surrey had a legal heraldic right to quarter these arms in his shield, Southwell professed to believe that this also was a treasonable act. Though admitting that Surrey had differentiated the arms with "three labels silver," this label, he said, was that of Prince Edward, the heir presumptive of the King. Surrey's use of this label, therefore, was proof of his intention to declare himself the heir to the throne.

This second reason advanced by Southwell for imputing treasonable motives to Surrey was also without the slightest legal justification, but the Privy Council seized upon it. At least Surrey's use of the arms of Edward the Confessor could be proved. In consequence, on 2 December Surrey was brought before Wriothesley, Hertford, and others of the Council in order that Southwell might repeat his charges in Surrey's presence and perhaps provoke him into some overt act.<sup>15</sup> As soon as Surrey could overcome his astonishment at the ridiculousness of what Southwell had to say he became contemptuous and expressed his opinion of the former friend who was trying to betray him. Then turning to his persecutors, he professed in-

<sup>13</sup> According to the rules of heraldry, only the arms inherited through the male line may be borne in the first quarter of a heraldic shield.

<sup>14</sup> Had Surrey borne such a quartering, his act would not have been without precedent. The Earl of Wiltshire had borne the arms of England so without question, as had the Earl of Hertford, with only a slight differentiation; Bapst, p. 346.

<sup>15</sup> This incident is recorded by Lord Herbert, p. 562 ff.; the interpretation of Surrey's actions is my conjecture.

credulity that even they could take the absurd accusations seriously and offered such arguments as could be offered against such false inferences. His words arousing nothing but bland doubt, he changed his tone, vehemently affirmed himself a true man, and demanded to be tried by justice. Bethinking then how the trial he requested would be conducted, and by whom, he ironically demanded that he be permitted to prove his innocence in single combat with his accuser. The demand so made stimulated his imagination. Although he did not know whether or not the statutes of the realm still sanctioned the practice, he repeated, at least half seriously, the formal challenge. As in the ancient days of chivalry God gave strength to the arm of the true and innocent man, he demanded the right to prove false the accusations against him by killing his accuser. He then elaborated. So confident did he feel that God would support him in his innocence, he was willing to fight Southwell "in his shirt"—meaning that he would give Southwell the advantage of wearing armor while he wore only the linen dress customarily worn beneath it.

Even at this time Trial by Ordeal and Trial by Single Combat were merely traditions of the past—practices long since discarded. To the Privy Council, Surrey's challenge was as absurd as the charges against him were to Surrey, but they admitted seeing no similarity as they brusquely refused his desire to prove his innocence in single combat. In any event it would be folly to risk the life of the Council's first witness. The immediate result was that both Surrey and his accuser were remanded into custody, pending further investigation. Before the official inquiry was begun, however, Southwell was released. This action of the Privy Council strengthened the common belief that Surrey would suffer death,<sup>16</sup> no matter what evidence—or lack of evidence—the investigation should bring to light.

v. In the meanwhile, word had reached the Duke of Norfolk at Kenninghall of the arrest of his son. To learn the cause of the trouble, he promptly wrote "to divers of his Friends . . . ,

<sup>16</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 533 & 546.

and particularly to [Gardiner], Bishop of Winchester."<sup>17</sup> His requests for information, falling into the hands of the Privy Council, should have been ample proof that he had no knowledge of Surrey's recent actions, even if Surrey's actions had been treasonable. Instead, the Privy Council professed to find in these letters statements which involved the Duke in a treasonable intrigue. He was commanded to London to appear before the Council. The Duke came from Kenninghall to present himself as commanded on Sunday, 12 December, in the afternoon. Without being given a chance to defend himself he was immediately arrested, conveyed by water to the Tower, and imprisoned.<sup>18</sup>

During the morning of the same day Surrey had been led openly from the Lord Chancellor's house in Holbourne, through the City of London, to confinement in the Tower.<sup>19</sup> This was a departure from custom. Prisoners of high rank were habitually taken to prison secretly, or by water, in order that they might escape the insults and abuse which the people commonly shouted at prisoners being conveyed under guard through the streets. Intending to heap every possible indignity upon Surrey, the Privy Council had ordered him to be led openly through the City of London on Sunday, when the streets were crowded. To the chagrin of Surrey's enemies, however, the people did not shout abuse at this prisoner. Instead, as Surrey passed by they sent up a great cry of lamentation, offering their sympathy in

<sup>17</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 563.

<sup>18</sup> Wriothesley, I, 176.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* Cf. Bodl. Lib., Ashmolean MS. No. 861, fol. 340, purporting to have been copied from the diary of Mr. Anthony Anthony, Officer of the Ordnance of the Tower of London under Henry VIII; here the record is "13 Dec., 1546, 4 P.M. The Duke of Norfolk and Hene Howard El of Surry his son, were brought to the Tower." But all other records give the date as 12 December. This journal of Mr. A. Anthony would be an extremely interesting work to discover, for Ashmole states in his copyings that it contained the record written by an "eye and ear witness" of all the state executions during the time of Henry VIII. At least three people saw it during the latter half of the seventeenth century: Ashmole; a Mr. Turner who copied from it to annotate the Bodleian copy of Lord Herbert's *Henry VIII* (shelf-mark, Fol. A 624); and Bishop Burnet (see Camden Society Publications, no. LXXVII (London, 1859), p. 305). Unfortunately, none of the three men records where he saw it. Nor can I find a clue from P.R.O., *S. P. 13 Vol. 9*, which contains a description of the coronation of Elizabeth "transcribed from Mr. Anthony Anthony's Collections."



his misfortune.<sup>20</sup> The Privy Council had misjudged the depth of the respect and admiration which the populace had for the scion of the Howards. To the common people he was the spirited and generous young nobleman who had inherited the military ability of his fathers, the brilliant strategist who had led them in many victorious charges; he was the skilled young knight who had roused their lusty cheers in the tourney, the fiery young Hotspur who had dared to use his fists as any self-respecting Englishman should, the proud young peer who was not above a lark at night; he was, as well, the personification of the chivalry of knighthood; handsome, distinguished in bearing, exacting in dress, brilliant in mind, he was the young aristocrat whom their King had so often chosen to show what England could do by way of a man.<sup>21</sup>

vi. The Privy Council was determined to get evidence of treason against both Surrey and his father. As soon as the two prisoners were safely confined in the Tower the Council lost no time in beginning a thorough investigation. At four o'clock that same Sunday afternoon John Gate, Sir Richard Southwell, and Wymond Carew were sent post haste to Norfolk, to seize and search all the possessions of the Duke of Norfolk and his son before any of the Howards could be warned of what was impending.<sup>22</sup> By sending a commission so quickly, the Privy Council hoped to discover evidence of treasonable intentions which might otherwise be destroyed or hidden.

The commission arrived at Kenninghall before daybreak on Tuesday, 14 December, bearing the first news of the Duke's arrest. The Duchess of Richmond and Elizabeth Holland were ordered to present themselves before the commission immediately. As soon as they could dress, they did so.

On hearing how the matter stood, the Duchess [of Richmond] was "sore perplexed, trembling, and like to fall down," but recovering, she reverently upon her knees humbled herself to the King, saying that although constrained by nature to love her father (whom she

<sup>20</sup> *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, J. G. Nichols, editor; Camden Society Publications, no. LIII (London, 1852), p. 52.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Bapst, p. 352; Padelford, p. 38.

<sup>22</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 548; *S. P.*, *Henry VIII*, I, ii, 264.

ever thought a true subject) and her brother ("whom she noteth to be a rash man"), she would conceal nothing<sup>23</sup>

but was willing to comply with every request of the commission, including the giving of evidence against her father and brother. Bess Holland, who had for years been the Duke's mistress, took the matter more calmly, but she also expressed her willingness to testify according to the wishes of the Privy Council. The commission next interviewed the Countess of Surrey, but learning that she was expecting a child within two months, they decided not to trouble her further. Even if she had been able to travel, she would have been a prejudiced witness—a kind of witness naturally abhorred by the Privy Council.

In dispatching the Duchess of Richmond and Bess Holland to London to testify before the Privy Council, the commission reported that they had found the Duchess had few jewels and a scant number of gowns, for she had disposed of most of her valuables to pay her debts. As Bess Holland, however, had been very liberally provided with jewels and clothing, she would be extremely anxious to show her goodwill and loyalty to the King's Council by her testimony. The commission also reported that all papers and documents at Kenninghall were impounded, but no mention was made of the treasonable coat of arms which ostensibly was the reason Surrey and his father were arrested. The commission's report concludes with a promise of diligence in further search and a complete report.<sup>24</sup> This further report, however, has not been preserved among the State Papers. As have almost all documents in this matter in which Sir Richard Southwell was concerned, the comprehensive report of the commission has mysteriously disappeared.<sup>25</sup>

vii. In London the Privy Council was trying by every possible means to get evidence against either Surrey or Norfolk. Presided over by the Earl of Hertford and Chancellor Wriothesley, the Council took the depositions of every witness that could be coerced into giving satisfactory testimony. Members

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> See below, note 63; cf. Brenan & Statham, pp. 422 & 435 ff.

of the Council also went daily to the Tower to quiz the prisoners.<sup>26</sup> The findings were extremely petty, but the Privy Council continued to take such depositions as follow:

Christopher Barker, Garter King at Arms,<sup>27</sup> testified concerning a conversation which he purported to have had with Surrey on 7 August, 1545:

Concerning the Earl of Surrey a little before he went to Boulogne, Richmond Herald wrote a letter to me to come with all speed to speak with the said Earl in a morning. And thither I ran, and tarried the same morning the space of an hour, or I spake with him. And at the last he sent for me into a gallery at his house in Lambeth,<sup>28</sup> and there shewed me a scutcheon of the arms of Brotherton, and St. Edward, and Amory, and Mo[w]bray quartered; and said he would bear it. And I asked him by what title; and he said that Brotherton bore it so. And I shewed him it was not in his pedigree. And he said he found it in an house in Norfolk, in stone graven so, and he would bear it. And I told him it was not for his honour so to do. . . . [But to] the last he said he would bear it, and that he might lawfully bear it. And after that I saw him so wilful, I spake to Mr. Warner, in Paul's, to tell him that he might not do it.<sup>29</sup>

A report of this conversation was apparently written down almost sixteen months before the Privy Council began the official investigation of Surrey's doings. It is difficult to understand why this record should have been made, unless Surrey's enemies had control of the officials of the College of Heralds and at this early date had definite plans for destroying Surrey. But even if this were true, should we believe that the conversation actually took place? As an official of the College of Heralds must certainly have known that the dukes of Norfolk, with perfect legitimacy, had long quartered the arms both of Brotherton and of Edward the Confessor upon their escut-

<sup>26</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 620.

<sup>27</sup> An official of the College of Heralds; as Bapst, p. 343, points out, this Christopher Barker was dubbed Knight of the Bath on 20 February, 1547, immediately after the execution of Surrey. As nearly all those who aided in convicting Surrey of treason received marked favors shortly after his death, the implication is obvious.

<sup>28</sup> The Duke of Norfolk's town house at this period.

<sup>29</sup> *MS. Heralds' College*, L. 14; printed by Nott, p. ci, with comment; also *L. & P.*, XXI, i, 1425.

cheons, it does not seem possible that Barker would have dared to deny Surrey's right to bear these arms at a time when Surrey was high in the King's favor.

The deposition of Sir Edmund Knyvet, Surrey's "cousin,"<sup>30</sup> was made up entirely of trivialities. He testified that Surrey liked the company of foreigners, welcomed them to his table, had an Italian jester, and had adopted certain foreign fashions in dress and manners. He also reported that Surrey, in protesting that he bore him no malice, had recently said, "No, no, cousin Knyvet, I malice not so low. My malice is higher. My malice climbs higher."<sup>31</sup> To find evidence of treason in such charges is more than difficult.

A deposition more dangerous to Surrey was made by Edward Rogers. He testified that Surrey had attempted to persuade his sister, the Duchess of Richmond, to become the King's mistress, to the intent that she might use the influence thus gained to the advantage of her family. As seems most probable, he twisted the meaning of Surrey's bitterly ironical statement to his sister in the matter of her marriage to Sir Thomas Seymour and deposed that Surrey,

pretending the face of a marriage to have succeeded between Sir Thomas Seymour and the said lady [the Duchess of Richmond], advised her when called by the king ("as it should be brought about that his Highness should do to move her in that behalf") to appear undecided and so temper her tale as to give occasion for being sent for again; "and so, possibly . . . his Majesty might cast some love unto her; whereby in process she should bear as great a stroke about him as Madam Destampz doth about the French king."<sup>32</sup>

This testimony was diametrically opposed to Surrey's actual attitude toward any of the proposed marriages between a How-

<sup>30</sup> According to *D.N.B.* (XXXI, pp. 338-339), Sir Edmund Knyvet (or Knevet) was the brother of Sir Thomas Knyvet (d. 1512), who married Lady Muriel Howard, widow of John Grey, second Viscount Lisle, and sister of Surrey's father. But Bapst (p. 348) thinks this Sir Edmund was the son of Sir Thomas and Lady Muriel. There may be some confusion in the account in *D.N.B.*, for there the date of Sir Edmund's death is given as 1 May, 1546; and his deposition referred to here is by *L. & P.* (XXI, ii, 555 (1)) assigned to December, 1546.

<sup>31</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 555 (1).

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, (4); the deposition of Sir Gwain Carew, which is printed in the same place, is similar to that of Rogers.

ard and a Seymour, but the Duchess of Richmond came forward to substantiate it. She confessed to the Privy Council that Surrey had urged her to marry Sir Thomas, "wishing her withall to endear her self so into the King's favour, [so] as she might the better rule here as others had done."<sup>33</sup> She then continued to testify that her brother had spoken with asperity of Hertford; that he had manifest a dislike for those who were properly called the new nobility; that he had dissuaded her from going too far in reading the Scriptures; and that he had set up an altar in a church at Boulogne.<sup>34</sup> Even the Privy Council was unable to substantiate any treasonable implications in this part of the Duchess's deposition, although these statements may have contained some truth.

The rest of the Duchess of Richmond's testimony was entirely invention. Her brother, she declared, had found in an old tale of chivalry certain heraldic arms attributed to Lancelot of the Lake. As the designs had pleased him, he had placed them in one of the quarters of his escutcheon. A foolish statement for the Duchess of Richmond to make. Had it been true, it could only have implied that Surrey was laying himself open to ridicule. But to this she added a more serious charge. Surrey had, she declared, placed over his escutcheon, in the guise of a crest, the Cap of Maintenance and the Crown of England, both royal emblems. In making these statements the Duchess either revealed unbelievable ignorance or deliberately twisted the facts. The emblem which she professed to believe the Cap of Maintenance was a simple cap trimmed with ermine fur which the Howards had long used as a crest,<sup>35</sup> indicating that certain forbears of the family had administered the laws of the country as judges.<sup>36</sup> As for the crown borne by Surrey, it was

<sup>33</sup> Lord Herbert, p. 563.

<sup>34</sup> The following pertinent explanation is offered by Bapst, p. 336, "Après avoir pris Boulogne, Henry VIII avait non pas détruit la cathédrale, ainsi que l'affirment à tort la plupart des chroniqueurs du temps, mais l'avait transformée en arsenal . . . Surrey réédifia dans cette église un autel à la Vierge; mais Henry VIII n'avait jamais pros crit le culte de Marie, pour laquelle il avait, au contraire, un certaine dévotion. (Voir son testament.) Il ne put donc prendre mal l'acte du Comte."

<sup>35</sup> An example of Lord Edmund Howard's use of this crest in 1513 is preserved in B.M., Cotton MS. Claudius C. III; cf. Bapst, p. 355 ff.

<sup>36</sup> Notably Sir William Howard, who died in 1309.

not the Crown of England; the crown in his crest was the Crown of Scotland, the use of which had been granted to Surrey's grandfather to commemorate the English victory on Flodden Field.<sup>37</sup>

All the wrong doings with which the Duchess of Richmond charged her brother are easily explained away or justified. Would that this were true of her actions in abetting his enemies' attempts to destroy Surrey. Her bitterness toward her brother seems to have arisen from his opposition to her marriage to Sir Thomas Seymour. If our conjecture be correct, when she retired to Kenninghall in June, 1546, she would have carried with her a feeling of resentment against Surrey for having prevented her from making a matrimonial alliance which would have enabled her, at least, to remain at court. At Kenninghall was Bess Holland, who hated Surrey because he always had an aversion to the presence of his father's mistress. To give vent to her animosity, Bess Holland would have done her utmost to increase the Duchess's resentment. She probably began by suggesting that Surrey had been selfish in failing to consider the benefits that would have accrued to his sister by her proposed marriage. As loneliness at Kenninghall multiplied in the Duchess's mind the delights of court life and strengthened her feeling of resentment, little was needed to convince her that she was very ill treated and that her brother was entirely responsible for this treatment. And having inherited the vindictive temperament of her mother, she conceived the bitter hatred which made her eager to do anything to harm her brother.

Having abetted the Duchess of Richmond's testimony against her brother, Bess Holland deposed to the Privy Council nothing to incriminate Surrey. To show her good will towards the Council she was anxious to testify, but to protect herself in the event that Surrey and his father escaped with their lives, she said nothing of consequence.

She only spoke in general terms of the Duke's having blamed [Surrey] for his want of skill in quartering the family arms. Of the Duke she reported no more than that he had complained of the King's having withdrawn from him his wonted confidence; that

<sup>37</sup> See above, p. 15.

he had remarked the King's increasing infirmities; that he had spoken with warmth of some of the new Nobility, who, he said, "did not love him"; and that he had seemed at times favorably disposed to the Roman Catholic religion.<sup>38</sup>

Among the State Papers are preserved many other depositions which the Privy Council procured by divers means.<sup>39</sup> These depositions show that the Privy Council failed to persuade only two persons to testify in some measure against the prisoners. The two men were Richard Fulmerston<sup>40</sup> and Hugh Ellis,<sup>41</sup> both "most earnest drudges and servants" of Norfolk and Surrey, who denied any and all charges of treasonable implication against their masters. The record of Sir Edward Warner's deposition is interesting as showing that Surrey's enemies had for some time been making definite plans to destroy him. Sir Edward deposed:

Being commanded . . . to write all such words as have been between me and the Earl of Surre[y] that might touch the King and his posterity, or that I have heard from others to that effect, I say that of the Earl himself I have heard nothing that I can remember. But last summer Master Devereux, speaking of the Earl's "pride and vainglory," said that it might be abated one day. When I asked what he meant, he said, "What if he be accused to the King that he should say, 'If God should call the King to his mercy, who were so meet to govern the Prince as my . . . father?'" I asked then if there were any such thing; and he said, "It may be so." Whereupon I gathered that it was so, and looked daily to see the Earl "in the case that he is now in."<sup>42</sup>

viii. All possible charges against Surrey which the ingenuity of the Privy Council could evolve from the depositions were brought together in a series of interrogations to be put to the accused. A draft of these questions, as corrected by the Lord Chancellor, Wriothesley, is as follows:

1. Whether you bear in your arms the "scotchen" and arms of King Edward that was King before the Conquest, commonly called St. Edward?

<sup>38</sup> Nott, p. xcix; Lord Herbert, pp. 563-564.

<sup>39</sup> It is well to remember that the rack and other instruments of torture were yet in use. <sup>40</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 553. <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 555 (7). <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, (3).

2. How long you have borne them?
3. By what authority or title?
4. Whether you are next heir or akin to St. Edward, and if so, how?
5. Whether your father or grandfather bore St. Edward's arms?
6. "Whether William the Conqueror did [to] your said ancestor (that at the time of the Conquest was then alive) any wrong by his conquest, or no?"
7. To what intent you put the arms of St. Edward in your coat?
8. Why you bear them at this time more than you or your father [did] at other times before?
9. Whether you have any inheritance from King Edward the Saint?
10. If so, where it lies and what you call it?
11. If the King should die in my Lord Prince's tender age, whether you have devised who should govern him and the realm? [Corrected from "who ought within the realm to be protector and governor of him during nonage?"]
12. Whether you have said that in such case "you or your father would have the rule and governance of him," or words to that effect?
13. What you have devised and done whereby you "might rule the King in his own time, or the Prince, if God should dispose of his Majesty"?
14. Whether you "procured any person to dissemble in anything with the King's Majesty to th' intent the same might grow in his favour for the better compassing of your purposes"? [Altered from "procured your sister or any other woman to be the King's concubine or not," and to what intent?]
15. "What words of reproach or slander you had of any of the King's Council, and what the words were and against whom?"
16. What arms have you given to any man, English or stranger, when and to whom?<sup>43</sup>

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, (8); *S. P., Henry VIII*, I, ii, 265, appends to the following set of charges this note: "This Paper, which is in the handwriting of Wriothesley, is without title or date, but is evidently the groundwork of the charges against the Duke of Norfolk and Earl of Surrey, and possesses considerable interest, from the words printed in small capitals being interlined by Henry VIII. himself, in a tremulous hand. The lacunae arise from the paper being torn."

"If a man cummyng OF THE COLATERALL LYNE TO THE HEYRE OFF the Crown, who ought NOT to beare thArmes of England BUT ON the seconde quarter, with the



No account has been preserved of Surrey's replies to these questions, which were undoubtedly put to him in one or more of the Privy Council's private examinations of their prisoners in the Tower; nevertheless, we can be sure that he upheld his right to the arms he bore, denied the charge of having urged his sister to be the King's concubine, and admitted no action of treasonable intent. Even if the Privy Council did resort to the rack to extort a confession from him—and it is extremely unlikely that the Council dared to submit a nobleman of such high rank to the tortures which were customarily reserved for those of base degree—they obtained no confession from the Earl of Surrey.

With the Duke of Norfolk, however, the Privy Council was more successful. Although Norfolk's bitterest enemies knew that he was guilty of no offence which could be legally recognized as treason, by trickery he was led to confess that he had committed treason by acts which legally were not treasonable.

---

difference of THEYRE auncestre, doo PRESUME to chaunge his right place, and beare them in the first quarter, leaving out the true difference of thauncestre, and, in the lieu thereof, use THE VERY PLASE only of the Heire Masle Apparant; HOW THYS MANS INTENT IS TO BE JUGGYD; AND WHETHER THYS importe any daunger, peril, or slaundre to the title of the Prince, or very Heire Apparant; and howe it wayeth in our lawes.

"If a man PRESUME to take into his armes an olde cote of the Crown, WHYCHE HYS AWCNCESTER NEVER BARE, NOR HE OF RYGHTE OWGHT TO BEAR, and use it without difference; whither it maye be to the peril or slaundre of the very Heire of the Crown, or be taken to tende to his disturbaunce in the same; and in what peril they be, that consent that he shuld soo doo.

"If a man cumpassing WITH HYMSELFE TO GOVERNE THE REALME, DO ACTUALLY GOO ABOGWGHT TO RULE THE KINGE, AND shuld, for that purpose, advise his daughter, or suster, to becom his harlot, THYNKYNG THERBY TO BRYNG IT TO PASSE, AND SOO WOLDE RULE BOTHE FADER AND SOOM, AS BY THYS NEXTE ARTVCLE DOTHE MORE APERE; WHAT THYS IMPORTYETH.

"If a man saye thies wordes, 'If the King dye, who shuld have the rule of the Prince, but my father, or I'; what it importeth.

"The depraving of the Kinges Counsaill.

"If a man shal saye thies wordes of a [man] or woman of the Realme, 'If the King were dede, I shuld shortly shit him upp'; what it importeth.

"If a man, provoked and compelled by his dieutie of alleageaunce, shal declare such matier as he herethe touching the King, and shall aftre be contynually threatened by the per[son] accused, to be killed or hurte for it; what it importeth.

"If a man take uppon him to use \_\_\_\_\_ in his Lordshipp, or to kepe ples himself free waren in his groun[ds, without] lycence; what it importeth.

"If a subject presume without ly[cence to] gyve armes to straungers; what it imp[orteth]."

When the Duke was first placed under arrest he flatly and truthfully denied having done hurt to the King's welfare. In a long and most convincing letter to the Privy Council he asserted his innocence and appealed to many persons who could prove it.<sup>44</sup> At the same time, or shortly thereafter, he wrote from the Tower another letter to his King's Majesty:

Most gracious and mercifull Sovereign Lord:

I, your most humble Subject prostitute at your foot, do most humbly beseech your Highness to be my good and gracious Lord. I am sure some great enemy of mine hath informed your Majestie of some untrue matter against me. Sir[e], God doth know, in all my life I never thought one untrue thought against you, or your succession, nor can no more judge or cast in my mind what should be laid to my charge, than the childe that was born this night. And certainly, if I knew that I had offended your Majestie in any point of untruth, I would declare the same to your Highnesse. But (as God help me) I cannot accuse myself so much as in thought. Most noble and merciful Sovereign Lord, for all the old Service I have done you in my life, be so good and gracious a lord unto me, that either my accusers and I together may be brought before your Royal Majestie; or if your pleasure shall not be to take that pains, then before your Council; then if I shall not make it apparent that I am wrongfully accused, let me, without more respite, have punishment according to my deserts. Alas, most mercifull Prince, I have no refuge but onely at your hands, and therefore at the reverence of Christ's passion have pity of me, and let me not be cast away by false enemies' informations. Undoubtedly, I know not that I have offended any man, or that any man was offended with me, unlesse it were such as are angry with me for being quick against such as have been accused for Sacramentaries. And as for all causes of Religion, I say now, and have said to your Majesty and many others, I do know you to be a Prince of such virtue and knowledge, that whatsoever laws you have in past times made, or hereafter shall make, I shall to the extremity of my power stick unto them as long as my life shall last. So that if any men be angry with me for these causes, they do mee wrong. Other cause I know not why any man should bear me any ill will; and for this cause I know divers have done, as doth appear by casting libels abroad against me. Finally (most gracious Sovereign Lord) I most humbly beseech your Majestie

<sup>44</sup> B.M., Cotton MS. Titus B.I, 94; printed by Nott, appx. XXXVIII.

to have pity of me, and let me recover your gracious favour, with taking of me all the lands and goods I have, or as much thereof as pleaseth your Highnesse to take, leaving me what it shall please you to appoint: and that according as is before written, I may know what is laid to my charge, and that I may hear some comfortable word from your Majestie. And I shall during my life pray for your prosperous state long to endure.

Your most sorrowful subject,  
Tho. Norfolk.<sup>45</sup>

As long as the Duke upheld his own integrity and protested his innocence his enemies were at a loss to discover anything which could be twisted into a capital offence. In consequence, a plea was lacking upon which to base a demand to Parliament for a bill of attainder, for Norfolk was a parliamentary lord and could not be brought before a common jury.

But a charge to bring against Norfolk was obtained from the Duke's own hand—in all probability by trickery and conjecturally as follows: After a fortnight's time had brought no answer to his appeals to the King and Council to be permitted to confront his accusers, Norfolk knew that legal justice was to be denied him. Such knowledge caused him to listen to his pretended friends, who were urging him to throw himself on the King's mercy. Reporting that his stubborn defense of his innocence seemed only to irritate his Majesty, they suggested that some admission of guilt might cause Henry VIII to relent and give him free pardon. To make plausible this suggestion, they recalled to the Duke's mind the ruse Gardiner had used to obtain justice from the King when his ruin seemed certain; that is, at one time the Duke of Suffolk and several of the Council who had long been Gardiner's enemies succeeded in destroying Henry VIII's confidence in him. This accomplished, royal agreement that Gardiner should be sent to the Tower was easily obtained and orders could be given for his arrest on the following morning. But before the order could be executed some of Gardiner's friends informed him of his danger. He immediately rushed to the Court, contrived to gain admittance into the King's presence, there made a full confession of all the

<sup>45</sup> As printed by Brenan & Statham, p. 438.

offences with which he had learned he was to be charged, and humbly sued to the King's Majesty for pardon, which was magnanimously granted. Learning what Gardiner had done, the next morning Suffolk remonstrated with Henry, who immediately replied, "You should have kept him from me. You know that my nature and custom hath been in such matters evermore to pardon those that will not dissemble, but confess their fault."<sup>46</sup>

Whether or not this be exactly what happened, Norfolk fell into such a trap. Despairing of obtaining his liberty by any other means, he submitted himself to the King's clemency by writing the following confession:

I, Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, do confesse and acknowledge my self most untruly, and contrary to my Oath and Allegiance, to have offended the King's most excellent Majestie in the disclosing and opening of his privie and secret Counsel at divers and sundry times, to divers and sundry persons, to the great perill of his Highness, and disappointing of his most prudent and Regal Affairs.

T. N.

Also, I likewise confess, That I have concealed high Treason, in keeping secret the false and traiterous Act, most presumptuously committed by my Son, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, against the King's Majestie and his Laws, in the putting and using of the Arms of St. Edward the Confessor, King of the Realm of England before the Conquest, in his Scutchion or Arms: which said Arms of St. Edward appertain onely to the King of this Realm, and to none other person or persons; whereunto the said Earl by no means or way could make any claim or title, by me, or any of mine or his Ancestors.

T. N.

Also, I likewise confess, That to the peril, slander, and disherison of the King's Majestie, and his noble Son, Prince Edward, his Son and Heir apparent, I have against all right, unjustly, and without authority, born in the first quarter of mine arms, ever since the death of my Father, the Arms of England, with a difference of the Labels of Silver, which are the proper Arms of my said Prince, to be born for this Realm of England only; whereby I have not

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Nott, p. cxii; Foxe, *Actes & Monuments*, George Townsend, editor (London, 1843-49), V, 690-691.

only done prejudice to the King's Majestie and the said Lord the Prince, but also given occasion that his Highness might be disturbed or interrupted of the Crown of this Realm, and my said Lord Prince might be destroyed, disturbed, and interrupted in fame, body and title, of the inheritance to the Crown of this Realm. Which I know and confess by the Laws of the Realm to be High Treason.

T. N.

For the which my said heinous offences, I have worthily deserved by the Laws of the Realm to be attainted of High Treason, and to suffer the punishment, losses, and forfeitures that appertain thereunto. And although I be not worthy to have or enjoy any part of the King's Majestie's clemency and mercy to be extended to me, considering the great and manifold benefits that I and mine have received of his Highness; yet I most humbly, and with a most sorrowful and repent heart do beseech his Highness to have mercy, pity, and compassion on me. And I shall most devoutly and heartily make my daily prayer to God for the preservation of his most noble Succession, as long as life and breath shall continue in me.

T. N.

Written the 12 day of the Month of January, in the yeer of our Lord God, 1547, after the computation of the Church of England, and in the 38 yeer of our Sovereign Lord Henry VIII, by the grace of God, King of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the Faith; and of the Church of England, and also of Ireland the supreme Head. In witness of all the premisses, I the said Duke have subscribed my name with my own hand, in the presence of the Lord Wriothesley, Lord Chancellor; the Lord St. John, Lord President of the Council; the Earl of Hertford, Lord great Chamberlain; the Viscount Lisle, Lord High Admiral; Sir Anthony Brown, Master of the Horse; Sir William Paget, Secretary; Sir Richard Rich; Sir John Baker of our said Sovereign Lord's privie Council; Sir Richard Lister, Sir Edward Montague, the two chief Justices.

Without compulsion, without force, without advice or counsel, I have and do subscribe the premisses,<sup>47</sup> submitting me onely to the King's most gracious pity and mercy, most humbly beseeching

<sup>47</sup> This paragraph is the usual statement written at the end of such confessions—even when the confession had been extorted by the use of the rack.

his Highness to extend the same unto me his most sorrowfull Subject.

By me Tho. Norfolk.<sup>48</sup>

(Signed as Witnesses)	Thomas Wriothesley Chancellor
	William St. John E. Hertford
	John Lisle Anth. Browne
	William Paget Richard Rich
	John Baker Rich. Lister
	Edward Montague

The contents of this confession prove that it was not written with sincerity. The Duke confesses treason for acts which were not treasonable. Nevertheless, his enemies had what they wanted. Proceedings were immediately begun to rush through Parliament a bill for Norfolk's attainer.

ix. The Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Surrey were held in such high esteem at the foreign courts that the Privy Council took great care to spread propaganda against them before the prisoners were brought to trial. To the English envoys were sent reports which would be most suitable to place in disfavor at that particular court the men who were to be condemned. Even before Norfolk was tricked into writing a confession of his guilt all English envoys were notified that both the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Surrey had confessed to treason against the King's Highness. For the benefit of the Protestant courts, this treason had to do with Popery. For the benefit of the Catholic courts, it had to do with Protestantism or something equally heinous.<sup>49</sup>

x. When Surrey was placed in confinement, first in the house of the Lord Chancellor and then in the Tower, he turned again to literature for solace, as he had done when imprisoned before. During the last seven weeks of his life he wrote poetical paraphrases from the penitential Psalms and the first five chapters of Ecclesiastes.<sup>50</sup> These translations are so extremely free that

<sup>48</sup> B.M., Harleian MS. No. 297, fol. 256; as printed by Lord Herbert, p. 568.

<sup>49</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 568; 593; 609; 610; 613; 644; 645; 752.

<sup>50</sup> Although external evidence is lacking of the date at which Surrey's translations from the Bible were written, the prologues to Psalms 73 & 88 strongly supple-

it seems possible to see the poet himself quite clearly in them. They describe Tudor England, and the characters which are portrayed can often be tentatively identified as persons who played a part in Surrey's life. Moreover, these paraphrases so clearly reveal a realization of the unreliability of friends, the malice of enemies, and the uncertainty of temporal position that it seems necessary to accept them as the poet's own beliefs—beliefs which Surrey had not held during his life previous to his final arrest.

Psalm 55 is the only one of these paraphrases that is not written in the poulter's measure. It is in unrimed alexandrines, and for this reason has been thought to have been written several years before the others. Internal evidence is against this view. Surrey did not find himself in such a situation as the verses expound until late in the year 1546. The lines:

It was a frendly foo, by shadow of good will,  
Myne old fere and dere frende, my guyde, that trapped me<sup>51</sup>

seem to refer to Surrey's betrayal to the Privy Council by Sir Richard Southwell. Differentiating it from the other paraphrases, however, is the note of hope in the eleventh and twelfth lines:

What speady way of wing, my playnts shold thei lay on,  
To skade the stormye blast that threatned is to me?<sup>52</sup>

May we not assume that Psalm 55 was written early in December, 1546, before Surrey realized that his enemies had at last succeeded in placing him in a situation from which there was no escape?<sup>53</sup>

When he wrote the paraphrase of Psalm 88, Surrey's hope

ment the internal evidence that he wrote these translations while imprisoned before being executed; cf. Bapst, p. 360 ff. & Padelford, p. 228 ff.

<sup>51</sup> Padelford, p. 110; ll. 22-23.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> The tone, as well as the content, of Surrey's paraphrase of Psalm 8 removes it from the sequence of his final work. It is in the poulter's measure, but its deviation from the Biblical original is not towards intensity of feeling. Its worshipfulness is mere ritual and the expansion of the element of nature to permit a more detailed description is in much the manner of Surrey's suppression of the love element in his adaptations from Petrarch to give more scope to descriptions of nature. Surrey's paraphrase of Psalm 8 was probably written much before the others. It is "polite verse."

of evading death had departed. Nevertheless, the poem makes clear that he had not entirely resigned his feeling of bitterness. The poet pleads with God to forgive his errors:

Graunt that the iust request of this repentaunt mynd  
So perce thyne eares that in thy sight som fauour it may fynd.  
My sowle is fraughted full with greif of follies past:  
My restles bodye doth consume and death approcheth fast.<sup>54</sup>

But he has not forgiven his friends for turning against him:

The faithfull frends ar fled and bannyshed from my sight,  
And such as I haue held full dere haue sett my frendshipp light.<sup>55</sup>

In the last two lines, Surrey does not, as does the Psalmist, attribute the forced absence of his friends to God's doings:

For they whome no myschaunce could from my loue devyde  
Ar forced, for my greater greif, from me their face to hyde.<sup>56</sup>

By the time Surrey wrote his paraphrases of Psalm 73 he had attained a greater ease of mind. Recognizing and accepting his fate, he prepared himself for death. Not yet, however, had he given up his condemnation of his enemies. He points out their sins in the certainty of gaining forgiveness for his own through repentance. The tone is faith in God, which is, in great measure, confidence that God will punish his enemies for their wickedness toward him.

At last, in translating from the first five chapters of Ecclesiastes, Surrey reached a greater philosophical maturity. In writing these paraphrases, he had discarded the bitterness and slight inward reservation that, although he has the greatest faith in God's goodness and justice, he nevertheless could wish that God would make the fact a little more obvious. All the bitterness is gone. The spirit of Christian humility and the firm conviction of the inconsequence of this life, except as a preparation for the life to come, takes its place:

We that liue on the earthe, drawe toward our decay;  
Ower childeren fill our place a while, and then they fade awaye.

<sup>54</sup> Padelford, p. 111; ll. 3-6.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 13-14.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112.



Such chaunges makes the earthe, and doth remoue for none,  
But sarues us for a place too play our tragedes vppon.<sup>57</sup>

Surrey finds faith and discards his former speculations engendered by doubt:

But this I found an endles wourke of payne and losse of tyme,  
Ffor he to wisdomes skooles that doth applie his mynd,  
The further that he wades ther in, the greater doubts shall find.<sup>58</sup>

The tone of Catholic faith in forgiveness for confession of sins and the valuelessness of all earthly things continues throughout Surrey's paraphrases of five chapters of Ecclesiastes. Surrey had experienced the values of this life and found them worthless. He came at last to look hopefully into the life to come, idealistically expecting to find perfection there.

xi. In spite of the peace which these paraphrases from the Bible seem to reveal that the poet made within himself, the Earl of Surrey made no peace with his enemies. Throughout the many examinations to which the Privy Council subjected him in the Tower he continued to deny that he was guilty of any wrongdoing, and in spite of every effort, he refused to be intimidated and could not be tricked into any admission whatsoever of treasonable intent. Nevertheless, the impossibility of finding true evidence upon which to bring a charge of treason could not save Surrey from his enemies on the Privy Council, whose chief concern was the end, not the means. Unable to find a better excuse, they decided to bring him to trial on the spurious accusation of unlawfully quartering the royal arms of Edward the Confessor upon his escutcheon. The indictment brought against Surrey contained but this single charge:

Whereas Parliament of 8 June to 18 July, 28 Henry VIII, enacted that whosoever, by words, writings, printing, or other external act, maliciously shall procure anything to the peril of the King's person or give occasion whereby the King or his successors might be disturbed in their possession of the Crown, etc. (Stat. 28 Henry VIII, cap. 7, §12) shall be guilty of high treason; And whereas Henry VIII is true King of England, and Edward formerly

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 100; ll. 7-10.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101; ll. 40-42.

King of England (commonly called Saynt Edward the Confessor) in right of the said realm of England used certain arms and ensignes, viz., "azur, a crosse flewry, betwene fyve merlettes golde," belonging to the said King Edward and his progenitors in right of the Crown of England, which arms and ensignes are therefore appropriate to the King and to no other person; And whereas Edward now prince of England, the King's son and heir apparent, bears as heir apparent the said arms and ensignes with three labels called "thre labelles sylver"; Nevertheless, one Henry Howard, late of Kenninggale, K. G., otherwise called Henry, earl of Surrey, on 7 Oct[ober], 38 Hen[ry] VIII, at Kenninggale, in the house of Thomas, duke of Norfolk, his father, openly used and traitorously caused to be depicted, mixed and conjoined with his own arms and ensignes, the said arms and ensignes of the King, with "thre labelles sylver."<sup>59</sup>

This indictment charges that the heraldic shield alluded to in the deposition of the Duchess of Richmond, Sir Richard Southwell, and others, was painted at Kenninghall on 7 October, 1546. We have insufficient evidence to determine whether or not the quarterings in this shield were precisely the same as those commented upon by Christopher Barker in his recorded conversation of over a year before. But there is in the British Museum a manuscript containing an uncolored drawing of a shield above which is written, "Howard, Earle of Surrey, for which he was attainted."<sup>60</sup> This is a shield of twelve quarterings which are named successively as follows: Howard; Brotherton; Warren; Mowbray, Edward the Confessor; Hamlin Plantagenet; Marshall; Brewse (Braose); Arundel; Ranulf Gernon, Earl of Chester; Ranulf Meschines, Earl of Chester; Segrave. This is believed to be one of the collections of divers coats and crests by Sir William Dethyke,<sup>61</sup> son of Sir Gilbert Dethyke, who was the Richmond Herald alluded to in Barker's recorded conversation. The handwriting of the inscription over the shield is probably of a later date, but there would seem to be some deal of truth in the assumption that the inscription is correct,

<sup>59</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 697; Nott, appx. XXXIII, prints "The Earl of Surrey's Inditement and Judgment" in the Latin.

<sup>60</sup> B.M., Harleian MS. No. 1453, fol. 69; reproduced in *Memorials*, appx. p. 32.

<sup>61</sup> *Memorials*, appx. p. 33; Brenan & Statham, p. 427 ff.

as the shield has been traced back to a date only one generation after Surrey's trial and there is some evidence that it is the work of an official of the College of Heralds.

The charge for which Surrey was tried for treason had no legal justification whatsoever, but if this was the heraldic shield upon which the indictment was based, the charge was ridiculous as well. As Brennan & Statham<sup>62</sup> states so forcibly,

To anyone acquainted with the laws of heraldry, the whole thing, shield, supporters, and all, is an absurdity, a kind of freak which Surrey might indeed have put together by way of passing an idle hour or two, but which, from a heraldic point of view, is absolutely unmeaning.

No precise record of the evidence presented at Surrey's trial has been discovered.<sup>63</sup> Nevertheless, it does not seem possible that those who devised the indictment of treason against Surrey would have permitted such an absurd piece of evidence to be introduced for all to see. To give at least some plausibility to their accusations, they must have relied upon vague verbal descriptions, rather than openly revealing their falseness.

But in spite of subterfuges to which Surrey's accusers may have resorted in presenting their evidence to a packed jury, it is mystifying why they elected to try him on an indictment which is so obviously false. If they could secure witnesses to swear that Surrey had committed treason by illegally bearing the arms of Edward the Confessor, they certainly could have secured persons to swear falsely to actions which had some actual semblance to treason. Surrey's right to bear these arms had been long established both by writ and by custom. For: Richard II, towards the End of his Reign, out of regard to his

<sup>62</sup> P. 428.

<sup>63</sup> *Acts of P. C.*, II, 106, contains the following item of 5 July, 1547: "This day Sir Robert Sowthwell, Master of the Rolles, deliverde uppe a bag of bokes sealed with his seale, wherein were conteigned writings concerning the attaindre of the Duke of Norfolk and therle of Surrey his sonne, to the saide Sir Robert and other lerned men hertofore deliverid to peruse, which bag it was hereapon ordred to be bestowed in the Studie at Westminster Palys where other recordes do lye." The exact contents of the bag remain unknown, but the fact that the "writings" had been "perused" with the knowledge of the administration suggests that this action was taken to expurgate all traces of illegality, or irregularity, from the records of the action taken to remove Norfolk and Surrey.

great Patron St. Edward (as he esteemed him) placed his Arms before his own; and accordingly we find many Entries in the Accounts of the Wardrobe, 22 Rich. II, of several Things embroidered *de Armis Sancti Eduardi* and *Domini Regis nunc partitis*, which he allowed to be also borne as Augmentations in the first Place by some of his chief Favourites, and among others by Thomas Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham.<sup>64</sup>

The arms of Edward the Confessor were confirmed to Thomas, Lord Mowbray, one of Surrey's ancestors, and a crest assigned by patent in 1394.<sup>65</sup> This right by writ was sanctioned by long usage. A later member of the family, Henry Howard of Corby, furnishes this concrete evidence of the unquestioned usage by the Howards of the arms of St. Edward and other royal arms:

The Three Lions of England, with a distinctive label of three points . . . was first allowed to Thomas (called Brotherton), the third son of Edward I, who having at the time an elder brother, it follows that the specific bearing could not be deemed any way prejudicial to the rights of the heir-apparent. These were transmitted to his heirs and frequently used singly in their shields. . . . [These arms] were born singly by Margaret, his daughter, Countess and afterwards Duchess of Norfolk, as appears by her seal at Norfolk House. . . . Richard II admitted the right of Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, to bear them, and also [the arms] of Edward, which are exemplified in a window that was in Kegworth Church, in Leicestershire. . . . Elizabeth Fitzalan, his wife, bears Brotherton only on her mantle in her portrait in painted glass in Long Melford Church. . . . John Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, on his seal in my possession, has Brotherton only on the shield in 1446. . . . John Mowbray, 4th Duke of Norfolk of the name, does the same, as seen in a deed at Norfolk House, dated Nov., 1465. . . . John Howard, 1st Duke of Norfolk of that name, bears a shield with Brotherton only, put up in St. George's Chapel, Windsor. . . . On the Gateway of Framlingham Castle, in the arms of Thomas Howard, 2nd Duke of Norfolk, these arms are in the first quarter.<sup>66</sup>

Too numerous to mention are the other extant examples of the Howard usage of the arms both of St. Edward and Brotherton.

<sup>64</sup> *Garter*, I, 175.

<sup>65</sup> *Cal. of P.R.*, 17 Richard II, pt. 1, m. 2.

<sup>66</sup> *Memorials*, appx. p. 68; see also Frederic Harrison, *Annals of an Old Manor-House* (London, 1893), p. 176.

xii. A show of legal form was given to the travesty of justice by which Surrey was condemned. As he was not a parliamentary lord—his title being one of courtesy only—he was tried by the common legal procedure.<sup>67</sup> Surrey's alleged offense had been committed in Norfolk; therefore, the indictment had to originate in Norwich, and the accused had to be tried before a common jury of Norfolk men.

The judges in Norwich, holding their offices by royal appointment, were duly amenable to the wishes of the King's Privy Council. The indictment of Surrey for treason, as quoted above, was found to be a true bill by the grand jury in session at Norwich Castle on 7 January, 1547.<sup>68</sup> Immediately a special commission of oyer and terminer was appointed to hold sessions at Guildhall in London to try, with a jury from Norfolk, the indictment returned against Surrey. For this special commission only those known to be hostile to Surrey were selected. Upon it were placed Henry Hoberthorn<sup>69</sup> (the Lord Mayor), Hertford, Wriothesley, St. John, and Paget, as well as others of the Privy Council, who had already determined that the accused was to be condemned.

The jury was also selected with great care. The jurors had to be Norfolk men; accordingly, a panel was summoned from there. The rule was that these men

should be elected *by lot*; but this would not meet the exigencies of the case. It was essential that the jury should be packed, and *selection* was therefore substituted for the drawing of lots, for the Howards were very popular in Norfolk, and the ordinary procedure might have resulted in the wrong kind of packing: to give the devil his due, Henry and his myrmidons were quite admirable in their attention to detail! The sheriff even ventured to indulge in a picturesque exhibition of conscience, for he wrote to ask the judges whether they thought it was *quite* right that Sir Edmund Knyvett and two other persons, who were known to be extremely hostile to Surrey, should be included, and the judges agreed to the re-

<sup>67</sup> The Duke of Norfolk, being a peer of the realm, had to be indicted by Parliament.

<sup>68</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 697.

<sup>69</sup> As Bapst, p. 358, notes, Henry Hoberthorn was knighted a few days after Surrey's trial.

moval of their names from the list, being well aware that the jury could be made quite safe in any event.<sup>70</sup>

Nor did the judges misplace their confidence in the servility of the men who were selected to serve on the jury.<sup>71</sup>

Surrey's trial was held in the great hall of the Guildhall in London on Thursday, 13 January, 1547. As the prisoner was brought thither the blade of the axe which was borne before him was turned forward, for Surrey was not as yet legally convicted. But even before he reached the court to see the judges and jury awaiting him, he well knew that when he started back to the Tower the cutting edge of that axe would be turned towards him, signifying that he had been condemned to death. The court was opened at nine o'clock in the morning by the reading of the special commission by authority of which the judges were appointed. Then Sir John Gage, Constable of the Tower, was ordered to bring the prisoner to the bar of justice while Lord Chancellor Wriothesley delivered the indictment (recited) as found at Norwich Castle. To the indictment Surrey pleaded, "Not Guilty." A jury was obtained "instantly," as it had already been selected, and the hearing began.<sup>72</sup>

Undaunted by the knowledge that he was condemned untried, and keeping his temper well in hand, Surrey rebutted the testimony brought forward against him so well "that he kept the Commissioners from nyne of the clocke in the forenounge till five of the clocke at night or he had judgment."<sup>73</sup> Unfortunately, the official record of the testimony introduced at the trial has disappeared, and only bits of information are to be found elsewhere. Lord Herbert,<sup>74</sup> who apparently had access to records not now extant, tells us that Surrey,

as he was of a deep understanding, sharp wit, and deep courage, defended himself many ways: sometimes denying their accusations as false, and together weakning the credit of his adversaries; some-

<sup>70</sup> Brenan & Statham, p. 430-431.

<sup>71</sup> The names of the men who served on the jury at Surrey's trial were: Sir William Paston, Sir James Bulleyn, Sir Francis Lovell, Sir Richard Gresham, Sir John Gresham, Sir John Clere, Sir Thomas Clere, Sir William Woodhouse, Christopher Hayden, Nicholas le Straunge, Miles Hubbert, and Henry Bedyngfeld (*L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 697).

<sup>72</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 697.

<sup>73</sup> Wriothesley, I, 177.

<sup>74</sup> *P.* 565.

times interpreting the words he said in a far other sense than in that in which they were represented. For the point of bearing his Arms (among which those of Edmund [Edward], the Confessor, are related) alledging that he had the opinion of Heralds therein.

From this statement it appears that, although the only charge in Surrey's indictment was for bearing the arms of St. Edward, testimony relative to other matters was brought against him during the trial.

Although he must have known that this trial was but a farce, Surrey stoutly defended himself for eight hours. Even the lies of a base-born witness, in testifying about a pretended argument he had had with the accused, failed to shake Surrey's restraint. This witness repeated certain high words which had been between them and—seizing this as an opportunity to boast—related the insolent replies he had made. Disdaining to reply directly to the testimony, Surrey merely turned to the jury and said, "I leave it to your judgment whether it were probable that this man should speak thus to the Earl of Surrey, and he not strike him."<sup>75</sup> Towards the end, however, he once permitted his temper to show. His nerves becoming frayed, after Sir William Paget had been for some time tormentingly cross-questioning him about matters unrelated to the indictment on which he was supposedly being tried, he called Paget an "inquisitor worthy to be the son of a bailiff."<sup>76</sup> Knowing that his words could do him no harm, as the verdict was pre-determined, Surrey at least had the satisfaction of silencing Paget with this remark and seeing that his vanity was wounded.

When the question was put to them the jury did not delay to return a verdict. The accused was declared guilty and sentence was imposed immediately. Surrey was condemned to be taken back to the Tower, thence to be led through the City of London to the gallows at Tiburn, there to be hanged, disembowelled, drawn, and quartered<sup>77</sup>—the sentence for treason.

The verdict was not a popular one. There are many authorities to support Rapin's comment:

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> The father of Paget had been a bailiff; cf. Bapst, p. 363.

<sup>77</sup> *L. & P.*, XXI, ii, 697.

Henry Howard died much pitied, being a Man of great Parts and High-Courage, with many other noble Qualities. His Sentence was generally condemned as an Act of high Injustice and Severity which loaded the Seymours with a popular Odium that they could never overcome.<sup>78</sup>

Even if we take such statements with a grain of salt—or even with two grains—the contemporary attitude towards the execution of the scion of the Howards remains evident.

Surrey was not, however, executed in the ignoble manner to which he was condemned. As the King's impending death could no longer be kept secret and Surrey's condemnation was so unpopular, the Privy Council was afraid to depart from the custom of allowing men of noble birth a more honorable death. Surrey therefore escaped the final insult which his enemies would have heaped upon him. Instead of dying by the rope at Tiburn, his sentence was commuted to dying under the axe on Tower Hill.

Knowing that Henry VIII might die at any moment—in which event the Privy Council would hardly have dared to assume openly the responsibility for Surrey's death<sup>79</sup>—his execution was arranged as secretly as possible and he was brought hurriedly to the block. On Wednesday, 19 January, 1547, but six days after his trial, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, "was lead out of the Towre to the skaffolde at the Towre Hill and their he was beheaded."<sup>80</sup> Only the death of Henry VIII during the night of 27 January saved his father from a similar fate.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Rapin's *Hist. of Eng.*, N. Tindall, translator (London, 1729), VII, 701.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. A. F. Pollard, *Hist. of Eng., 1547-1603*, pp. 4-7, where he discusses the source of the power of the Privy Council.

<sup>80</sup> Wriothesley, I, 177. Of Surrey's conduct on the scaffold we have no reliable record. Among the ms. notes in the Bodleian copy of Lord Herbert's *Henry VIII* (described above, note 19), opposite p. 570, is the following: "Vpon Tower hill . . . ye sayd Harry Hauward submittinge himselfe to ye Law, sayinge yt he was iustly condemned by ye Lawe & was come to dye vnder ye Lawe & humbly desired God to forgive him his offences & also requiringe of ye kings Mats. to forgiue him his Trespasses & so made his petition to God & so he was beheaded, on whose soule [God] have mercy. Amen." This follows so closely, however, the conventionalized descriptions of executions of the time that its accuracy must be questioned unless it can be supported by other evidence.

<sup>81</sup> The death of Henry VIII on the night of 27 January, 1547, saved the Duke of Norfolk from following his eldest son to the scaffold. After Norfolk had been led to



Surrey's body was first buried in the church of All-Hallows-Barking, near the Tower.<sup>82</sup> In 1614, Henry, Earl of Northamp-

---

write his spurious confession of treason, his enemies moved to bring about his execution as quickly as possible. As he was a peer of the realm, however, he could not be disposed of with such expedition as his son had been. Not being in session, Parliament had to be convened before a bill for the Duke's attainder could be presented to that body. This necessitated delay.

Although after Parliament was opened no impediment prevented the prompt passage of the bill attainting the Duke of Norfolk, not until 27 January could the House of Lords be summoned to attend in their robes to receive the royal ratification of the bill. The King being too ill to attend in person, the Lords were called upon to receive the bill as ratified by a commission especially appointed to affix the King's signature to it by stamp. At the same time an order was sent directing that the bill should be enrolled.

The legal procedure to bring about the Duke of Norfolk's execution was completed on the evening of 27 January. Orders were immediately given to bring him to the block the next morning. But the King's death stayed the executioner's axe. Although Henry VIII's death was not publicly announced until 31 January, he died during the night of the twenty-seventh. It is said that this interval between Henry's death and the public announcement was spent in debating what was to be done with Norfolk. Whether this be true or not, Norfolk was not executed. He was held a prisoner in the Tower until 1553, when the first act of Queen Mary was to free him from prison. Immediately thereafter the bill of attainder against him was declared null and void and the right of the Howards to bear the arms of St. Edward and Brotherton was confirmed by Parliament. With his title and estates restored, Norfolk retired to Kenninghall. Eighty years old and his health ruined by his long imprisonment, he died about a year later, on 25 August, 1554. Surrey's eldest son, Thomas, inherited his grandfather's titles and estates. Cf. Nott, p. cxii ff.

<sup>82</sup> Surrey left by Lady Frances, his wife, two sons and three daughters. One of the first acts in Edward VI's reign was to take these children from their mother and place them under the care of their aunt, the Duchess of Richmond. Why this was done it is difficult to say, but the Duchess accepted the charge willingly and faithfully fulfilled her duties as the guardian of Surrey's children. The tutor whom she secured to continue their education was Foxe, the celebrated martyrologist. He took great pains with his pupils, whose learning came to be widely acknowledged.

As mentioned above, Thomas, Surrey's eldest son, became the fourth Duke of Norfolk in 1554. He enjoyed great position and much influence throughout the reign of Mary and the first years of Elizabeth. But becoming involved in the intrigues of Mary, Queen of Scots, he fell into disgrace and was tried for treason on 16 January, 1572, found guilty, and condemned to death. Owing to Elizabeth's hesitation, however, his execution was postponed time and again. Finally, on 2 June, 1572, he followed in his father's footsteps to the block on Tower Hill.

Surrey's second son, Henry, was more fortunate. Elizabeth herself assumed the charges for completing his education. He was sent to King's College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of Master of Arts in 1564. Although his brother's disgrace brought him into disfavor at the Court in 1572, and for some years he was destitute of both honor and money, toward the close of Elizabeth's reign he succeeded in destroying the prejudices against him and regained his Queen's confidence. When James I came to the English throne this Henry was immediately created Lord

ton, second son of the Earl and Countess of Surrey, moved the bodies of both his parents to the Church at Framlingham,<sup>83</sup> Suffolk, where he had built an elaborate tomb to their memory. On this tomb is the inscription:

HENRICO HOWARDO THOMAE SECVNDI<sup>84</sup> DVCIS  
NORFOLCIAE FILIO PRIMOGENITO THOMAE TERTII  
PATRI COMITI SVRIAE ET GEORGIANI ORDINIS  
EQVITI AVRATO IMMATVRE ANNO SALVTIS  
MDXLVI ABREPTO ET FRANCESCAE VXORI  
EIVS FILIAE IOANNIS COMITIS OXONIAE HENRICVS  
HOWARDVS COMES NORTHAMPTONIAE FILIVS  
SECVNDO GENITVS HOC SVPREMVVM PIETATIS  
IN PARENTES MONVMENTVM POSVIT.  
ANNO DOMINI 1614.<sup>85</sup>

xiii. The Earl of Surrey died as proudly as he had lived. Refusing to renounce the beliefs and principles which had guided his actions, he could not admit that the old political order—to which at this time religion was inextricably joined—was giving way to the new. He was prepared to die rather than to recognize the new forces which had usurped the ancient functions of the old nobility in the governance of England. He died for a political ideal which England was discarding, and his death was futile in proportion as all resistance to change, conservatism, is futile. His life and his death contributed to political England only as

---

Howard of Marnhill and Earl of Northampton. The new Earl was appointed to many high offices by the first of the Stewarts, whose bounty he enjoyed until his death in 1614.

All three of Surrey's daughters married. Jane, who became "one of the most learned ladies of a learned age," married Charles Neville, 6th Earl of Westmorland. Catherine, who married Henry, 19th Baron Berkeley, was also famed for her scholarship. Of Margaret little is known except that she married Henry, 7th Baron Scrope of Bolton. Cf. Nott, p. cviii ff.

<sup>83</sup> Although there has been some doubt that Surrey's body was actually moved to Framlingham, this doubt is dispelled by the Bodleian copy of *Memorials of the Howard Family* (shelf-mark 2182, h.b. 5), p. 19. This copy, which was formerly owned by Charlotte, Countess of Effingham, contains the ms. note, "In making a repair of this monument in Oct., 1835, The Rev. George Atwood, Curate of Framlingham, discovered the remains of the Earl directly under his figure on the tomb."

<sup>84</sup> According to the computation of that time, Surrey's father was the second and not the third Duke of Norfolk, see above, ch. I, note 19, p. 15.

<sup>85</sup> Bodl. Lib., *Gough Maps*, 29, fol. 64<sup>v</sup>.

conservatism contributes to progress the futile but all important resistance which prevents too rapid change.

Surrey's positive contribution to English culture, however, was far greater, both in quality and quantity, than any conservative, or negative, influence he may have had on English politics; for to England he presented and exemplified a new standard of culture. Only by recognizing the forces of political and religious tradition in Surrey's environment, and by acknowledging the lack of all other tradition in England at this time, is it possible to understand how one man could in himself contain such a firm resistance to political change that he was willing to give up his life for his conservative convictions, yet even in doing so be among the first to accept change as exemplified in a new culture, the awakening of the intellect, and the rebirth of literature.

By his birth Surrey was the heir of a noble family which was new enough to have retained its physical vigor, but old enough to have gained the leadership of the conservative old nobility. Conservatism was the dominant political tradition in the environment of the Howards, who possessed great power and many rights under the old political order. Having had his political convictions formed by such an environment, having inherited the vitality to act and the right to lead, and being faced with the necessity of defending his inheritance, Surrey was forced to resist all political change. But he was not bound by cultural traditions.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century England had almost no art and few social graces. Such learning, or interest in learning, as England contained was almost entirely confined to the clergy. Understanding of Chaucer's metrics had been lost. Refinements of manners were unknown. Into this England was carried the cultural influence of the Renaissance. Italy had revitalized the classical traditions which had been preserved by the clergy through the Middle Ages. Intellectual curiosity had been reborn in Italy, and from Italy new thought, new art, new literature, new culture spread northward and westward over Europe.

Surrey—his intellectual curiosity aroused by his childhood

tutor, and his mind stimulated by the "new learning"—became a student of the new Italian literature. In France, which was imitating Italy, he found a new and becoming fashion of dress, a new pride in graceful carriage, and a new refinement of manners in social conduct. Having accepted the new culture, both intellectual and social, he made it his own and carried it to the English Court. As he had the best blood of England in his veins and held a high position in England, English courtiers followed his example. Learning and social graces became the court fashion. Surrey himself became a prototype not only of his contemporaries, but of the Elizabethan courtiers as well.

But Surrey's greatest contribution to England was a new poetic tradition. Although the writing of verse was to him merely a pleasant pastime, an amusing means of filling his idleness, he established a firm foundation for the development of English poetry. He refined English poetic style. He demonstrated that it was possible in his time to write standard English and evolved the poetic diction which was to be current for the next two centuries. He experimented with the poetic innovations of the Renaissance and created new and effectual English poetic forms. He discovered the importance in translating poetry of retaining the spirit and the true meaning of the original and disclosed that this was more nearly possible if the translator did not attempt to make an exact translation of the words of the original. He established in English literature the tradition of chivalrous poetry of love which the Elizabethans and their immediate successors followed to produce that great quantity of amorous verse. He discovered the prosodic possibilities of modern English; he refined poetic diction; and he introduced into our language blank verse—the verse form in which the noblest English poetry has been written.

## APPENDIX I

### SURREY'S CONTRIBUTION TO ENGLISH LITERATURE

The poetry of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, was written in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. When Surrey and his immediate predecessor, Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Elder, began to write there was no dominant English literary tradition.<sup>1</sup> The rapid change in the language and the instability of social conditions during the fifteenth century had interrupted literary continuity in England. Knowledge of the poetic technique of Chaucer had been lost, and excepting only the songs, the metrical forms in which poets of that time cast their writings have little to commend them to the modern ear. The four outstanding faults which characterize this poetry are: (1) looseness and disorderliness of meter; (2) clumsiness of diction, now gaudy, now grotesque; (3) indistinctness and awkwardness of expression; (4) desultory exuberance of treatment both in matter and in thought.<sup>2</sup>

A great reformation of English metrics and versification took place in the sixteenth century. As recognized by *The Arte of English Poesie* in 1589:<sup>3</sup>

In the later end of [Henry VIII's] raigne spro[n]g vp a new company of courtly makers, of whom Sir Thomas Wyat th'elder and Henry Earle of Surrey were the two chieftaines, who hauing trauailed into Italie, and there tasted the sweete and stately measures and stile of the Italia[n] Poesie as nouices newly crept out of the schooles of Dante, Arioste, and Petrarch, they greatly polished our rude & homely maner of vulgar Poesie, from that it had bene before, and for that cause may iustly be sayd the first reformers of our English meetre and stile. . . . Henry Earle of Surrey and Sir Thomas Wyat, betweene whom I finde very litle differe[n]ce, I repute them (as before) for the two chief la[n]ternes of light to all others that haue

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Berdan, p. 504.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Saintsbury, *Hist. of Eng. Prosody* (London & New York, 1906), I, 304.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 48 & 50.

since employed their pennes vpon English Poesie, their conceits were loftie, their stiles stately, their conueyance cleanelly, their termes proper, their meetre sweete and well proportioned, in all imitating very naturally and studiously their Maister Francis Petrarcha.

Although this was an enlightening critical comment for the time at which it was written, today we seek to be more exact and more explicit.

The reformers of English poetry in the first half of the sixteenth century were Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry, Earl of Surrey; and the activating influence upon them was the Renaissance literature of the Continent, where Italy had first produced the new poetic forms and the cultivated court life which together stimulated in Western Europe a much more discriminating taste and a greater appreciation of refined language and manners. Therefore, if we recognize the figurative language in "hauing trauailed into Italie, and there tasted the sweete and stately measures and stile of the Italian Poesie," we can agree with *The Arte of English Poesie* (although we now know that Surrey in his person never visited Italy) and acknowledge that Italy furnished the materials which enabled Wyatt and Surrey to evolve a new poetic diction and to cast it into new metrical forms—to create a new English poetry. But we can no longer concur in finding "very little difference" between the poetry of these two "chief lanternes of light," and we find ourselves forced to question the literary tradition of the close interrelation of Wyatt's and Surrey's literary work<sup>4</sup>—to question the assumption that they were very close literary friends who, in the first half of the sixteenth century, brought the sonnet and other Italian Renaissance innovations into England and worked together to improve English poetry. Even if we assume that each did know and admire the literary accomplishments of the other,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Such an interpretation seems to have derived chiefly from the words quoted above from *The Arte of English Poesie*. It was, of course, encouraged by the proximity in time of their writings and by these being published together at least eight times in the thirty years following the first edition of *Tottel's Miscellany* (June, 1557). Possibly references to Surrey's having known Sir Thomas Wyatt the Younger were also misread.

<sup>5</sup> Our evidence of this is confined to Surrey's three poetic tributes to Wyatt,

we now realize that Wyatt and Surrey met seldom, if at all,<sup>6</sup> and had very little in common. Wyatt was about fifteen years older than Surrey and died before the younger poet was twenty-five. While they were both mature their positions and their dispositions were very different. Wyatt was an active supporter of Cromwell and the Low Church; Surrey was the active enemy of Cromwell and held to the traditions of Catholicism. When and if they met, the men were held apart by the differences in their ages and social positions, by the hostility between their religious beliefs, by the conflicts between their political interests.

Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Elder (1503?-1542), lived almost entirely on the Continent from 1525 to 1540. His life there brought him into contact with the cultivated court society and with the new literature of the Renaissance. Under this influence Wyatt attempted to introduce many of the new poetic innovations of the Continent directly into English poetry without attending sufficiently to the differences between the English and the Romance languages. Not until after Surrey—appreciating the non-conformities of the Italian, the French, and the English languages—had experimented with the new forms and used his cultivated taste in determining the necessary variations from the originals, did the developments of the Italian Renaissance become a vital influence in English poetry. If we accept, as does Professor Padelford,<sup>7</sup> “the key to the correct reading of Wyatt’s earlier pentameter verse” which Miss Ada K. Foxwell<sup>8</sup> has offered, or if we accept as fact that most of his poetry antedated Surrey’s, or if we believe that Wyatt influenced Surrey but Surrey did not influence Wyatt, then to Wyatt we must accredit the reformation of the iambic pentameter line in English—the metrical verse which has become the most widely used and the most characteristic English verse form. Certainly we

---

John Leland’s *Naeniae in mortem Thomae Viati*, and Miss A. K. Foxwell’s interesting conjectures concerning the history of the Devonshire MS.; see above, ch. V, xi, and notes (p. 94).

<sup>6</sup> Wyatt spent most of his mature years on the Continent, and even a cursory comparison of the lives of the two men will show how few were their opportunities to meet.

<sup>7</sup> Padelford, p. 45 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *A Study of Sir Thomas Wyatt’s Poems* (London, 1911) & *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (London, 1913), II.

can admit that in some of Wyatt's poems (which are usually designated his later work) he demonstrated that the ten-syllable iambic line could be written regularly, and that variations were not the necessity they had been to his predecessors, but should be used for effect. In any case, Surrey was probably indebted, to some extent at least, to Wyatt's work; but he far surpassed the elder poet in discovering the prosodic possibilities of English verse and discriminated much more wisely in evolving from Italian models the forms consonant with the English language. It was Surrey's poetry that demonstrated to those who followed the poetic genius of the current English.

It is generally recognized that style is Surrey's predominating poetical virtue, and that his refinement of poetic diction contributed much to the improvement of English poetry. The language of poets was archaic when Surrey began to write, but he discarded the archaic language and the pedantic words of which his immediate predecessors had been so ridiculously fond—words for the most part forcibly reft from Latin or French<sup>9</sup>—and created a new poetic diction. Alliteration, so consonant with the writing of all former English poetry, he retained. To the modern ear alliteration is at times too much emphasized in his verse, but his use of it is for the most part delightful. Although he also retained the occasional use of such archaisms as *eke*, the prefix *y*, and the old suffix *en* and often used a phrase or expression typically Chaucerian, Surrey's diction is vivid, direct, and euphonious. In contrast to his predecessors, he recognized the necessity of accepting a fixed rhythmical standard for a word and not varying its value and balance entirely at the need of the poet.<sup>10</sup> And having set up a standard for himself, he was careful to place the tonic accent only on the even syllables; except when introducing proper names into his verse, he used the trochee commonly only in the first foot.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Padelford, p. 53, "In [Surrey's] amatory and polite verse [only] approximately five and one half per cent of the words are of Latin or French derivation; in the translations from Ecclesiastes, seven per cent; in the translations from the Psalms, five per cent; and in the *Aeneid*, a little over eight."

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Saintsbury, *A Short Hist. of Eng. Lit.* (3rd edition, London & New York, 1903), p. 247.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Courthope, *Hist. of Eng. Poetry*, II, 93, "Lines in which he throws the accent on a weak syllable, or uses a trochee before the cæsure, are so few that they



Surrey created a fresh poetic diction, and as well, cast his verse into metrical forms new in English. Of these, one of the two most important was the sonnet—the introduction of which into English poetry has been attributed both to Wyatt and to Surrey. Without evidence more conclusive than we now have no one can prove who was the first to write a sonnet in English, but even if we do not accept as final Miss Foxwell's conclusion<sup>12</sup> that nineteen of Wyatt's sonnets were probably written between 1528 and 1532, it seems necessary to assign the first English usage of this metrical form to Wyatt on no more secure grounds than that he was the older writer of the two.<sup>13</sup> The point is relatively unimportant if compared with the significance of the discovery that the involved rime-scheme of the Italians, which their language so readily permitted, could be simplified without losing the effectiveness of the form which

not alone, but chiefly—was the means of inducing English poets. . . to settle the poetical accentuation of their language, to discard doggerel for regular metre, to arrange a poetic diction which should be neither stiff with the "aureate" verbiage of the rhetoricians, nor clownish with the vernacular of the doggerellists.<sup>14</sup>

It was Surrey who demonstrated the effectiveness in English of using a freer rime-scheme and a more varied structural division than permitted in the Italian form of the sonnet; it was he who established what is now called the Elizabethan or Shakespearean sonnet as a standard English poetic form;<sup>15</sup> it was he

---

can be cited: Love, that liveth and reigneth in my thought; (2) The soote season, that bud and bloom forth brings; (3) The swift swallow, pursueth the flyes smale; (4) To Wyatt's Psalms should Christians then purcháse; (5) Of just David, by perfect penitence; (6) As proud Windsör, where I in lust and joy." (Numbers not in source.)

<sup>12</sup> *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, II, 26.

<sup>13</sup> Such evidence as is advanced by Walter L. Bullock in "The Genesis of the English Sonnet Form," *PMLA*, XXXVIII, no. 4 (1923), pp. 729-733, to demonstrate Surrey's debt to Wyatt's sonnets is in my opinion far from conclusive. As is, I trust, made clear in the foregoing pages, I very much doubt that Surrey's "extreme respect for Wyatt both as a poet and as a man" (*ibid.*, p. 729) can be demonstrated. And unless this opinion is assumed to be fact, such arguments as Mr. Bullock's lack a major premise.

<sup>14</sup> Saintsbury, *History of Eng. Lit.*, p. 243.

<sup>15</sup> "It will be noticed . . . that whereas Wyatt was content with two rimes for his octave . . . Surrey frankly makes up his sonnet of three quatrains and a couplet";

who made the sonnet flexible by the use of the run-on line and gave it currency by the use of a less involved rime-scheme.

Fifteen of Surrey's sonnets have been preserved.<sup>16</sup> Rime-schemes used once in these are: abab abab abab aa, abab abab abab bb, abba cddc effe gg, abab cdcd ecec ff, abab cdcd eef ggf; the rime-scheme abab cdcd efef gg is used ten times. All but one end in couplets. In only three does he use less than six rimes; of these, two are adaptations from Petrarch; in the third, probably by chance, the tenth and twelfth lines rime with the fifth and seventh. These few data demonstrate Surrey's experimentation in rime-schemes and his preference for the form which the Elizabethans most commonly copied.

Petrarch's Italian sonnets were the chief influence upon Surrey's amatory poetry. He not only wrote English adaptations of several of these sonnets; from them he seems to have drawn directly many of his conceits, and he constructed all his amatory verse on the example of his Italian master, whose rule was "to select a central thought and to surround it with a variety of analogous ideas and images leading up to an artistic climax."<sup>17</sup> Five of Surrey's eight sonnets having love as the central thought are translations or adaptations from Petrarch.<sup>18</sup>

*CHEL*, III, 199. We should note, however, as does Berdan, p. 523, "That this form [of three quatrains and a couplet] originated with Surrey is very doubtful, since it was used by Wyatt, although with a slightly different rime-scheme, by Grimald, and by several of the Uncertain Authors; Surrey's use of it, however, in all probability gave it currency. It was Surrey's fortune to be accepted as the representative of the age—the age when for the first time since Chaucer, the language had become relatively fixed in the forms of the words, and when the poetic technique had passed beyond the obviously experimental stage."

<sup>16</sup> "Brittle beautie, that nature made so fraile," assigned to Surrey by Tottel, may or may not be a sixteenth. See Padelford, p. 209; Nott, p. 288; Ruth Hughey, "The Harrington MS. at Arundel Castle and Related Documents" in *Library*, 4th series, XV, 4, (March, 1935), p. 431. In this article Miss Hughey announces that this ms., of which she is preparing an edition, contains a large number of unknown poems; but until the publication of Miss Hughey's find speculation is futile concerning the additional light it may throw on Surrey's poems.

<sup>17</sup> Courthope, *Hist. of Eng. Poetry*, II, 80.

<sup>18</sup> "In Ciprus springes—whereas dame Venus dwelt" is another that has the appearance of being a translation of an Italian original. "If not a translation, Surrey must be allowed to have successfully imitated the Italian manner," writes Nott, p. 279, and suggests *Orlando Furioso*, I, 78, as a possible source of the thought on which the poem is built.

In these he demonstrates that he understood the art of translation,<sup>19</sup> for he has translated accurately the central thought and manner of treatment of each original while wisely refraining from attempting to translate slavishly the Italian words. If Petrarch's conceit was pleasing in translation, Surrey translated it accurately; but he regularly omitted or changed the conceits which, in English at least, seem preposterously artificial. As Surrey's observation of nature was minute, though his recognition was of the general movements of the passions rather than of the individual characteristics and weaknesses of human nature, in his English adaptations he suppressed a part of Petrarch's direct references to individual emotion to dwell on the description of nature. And the nature which he described was the nature he knew—English, not Italian. This manner is well shown by his adaptation of Petrarch's sonnet (*In Morte*, 42), in which Surrey has accurately expressed Petrarch's thought while, in my opinion, surpassing the original in his description of nature.

Zefiro torna, e 'l bel tempo rimena,  
 E i fiori e l'erbe, sua dolce famiglia,  
 E garrir Progne e pianger Filomena,  
 E primavera candida e vermiglia.  
 Ridono i prati e 'l ciel se rasserena;  
 Giove s'allegra di mirar sua figlia;  
 L'aria e l'acqua e la terra è d'amor piena;  
 Ogni animal d'amar si riconsiglia.  
 Ma per me, lasso! tornano i più gravi  
 Sospiri, che del cor profondo tragge  
 Quella ch' al ciel se ne portò le chiavi;  
 E cantar augelletti e fiorir piagge  
 E'n belle donne oneste atti soavi  
 Sono un deserto e fere aspre e selvagge.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> "[Surrey was] the first English poet who understood and exemplified the art of translation"; Robert Bell, *Poetical Works of Henry Howard* (London, 1854), p. 31. As evidence of the truth of this, one has only to contrast Wyatt's "The longe love, that in my thought doeth harbar" with Surrey's "Loue, that liueth and reigneth in my thought" (both translations of Petrarch's *Le Rime*, no. 140); this is done excellently by Berdan, pp. 520-523.

<sup>20</sup> I quote Petrarch's sonnets from *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca*, di su gli originali, commentate da Giosue Carducci e Severino Ferrari (Firenze, 1929); in this work the first sonnet I quote is poem no. 310 and the second no. 164.

The soote season, that bud and blome furth brings,  
 With grene hath clad the hill and eke the vale:  
 The nightingale with fethers new she singes:  
 The turtle to her make hath tolde her tale:  
 Somer is come, for euery spray nowe springes,  
 The hart hath hong his olde hed on the pale:  
 The buck in brake his winter cote he flinges:  
 The fishes flote with newe repaired scale:  
 The adder all her sloughe awaye she slinges:  
 The swift swallow pursueth the flyes smale:  
 The busy bee her honye now she minges:  
 Winter is worne that was the flowers bale:  
 And thus I see among these pleasant thinges  
 Eche care decayes, and yet my sorow springes.<sup>21</sup>

Also characteristic of Surrey's manner of adaptation, and possibly a model for the later Elizabethan poetic complaints in which nature was held up to reflect the dissatisfaction of the lover, is his treatment of Petrarch's sonnet (*In Vita*, 131):

Or che 'l ciel e la terra e 'l vento tace  
 E le fere e gli augelli il sonno affrena,  
 Notte il carro stellato in giro mena  
 E nel suo letto il mar senz' onda giace;  
 Vegghio, penso, ardo, piango; e chi me sface  
 Sempre m'è inanzi per mia dolce pena:  
 Guerra è 'l mio stato, d'ira e di duol piena;  
 E sol di lei pensando ho qualche pace.  
 Così sol d'una chiara fonte viva  
 Move'l dolce e l'amaro ond' io me pasco;  
 Una man sola mi risana e punge.  
 E perchè'l mio martìr non giunga a riva,  
 Mille volte il dì moro a mille nasco;  
 Tanto do la salute mia son lunge.

Alas so all thinges nowe doe holde their peace.  
 Heauen and earth disturbed in nothing:  
 The beastes, the ayer, the birdes their song doe cease:  
 The nightes chare the starres aboute dothe bring:  
 Calme is the Sea, the waues worke lesse and lesse:  
 So am not I, whom loue alas doth wring,

<sup>21</sup> Arber, p. 4.

Bringing before my face the great encrease  
 Of my desires, whereat I wepe and syng,  
 In ioye and wo, as in a doutfull ease:  
 For my swete thoughtes sometye doe pleasure bring:  
 But by and by the cause of my disease  
 Geues me a pang, that inwardly dothe sting,  
 When that I thinke what grieve it is againe,  
 To liue and lacke the thing should ridde my paine.<sup>22</sup>

Though in making this adaptation Surrey followed his original more closely than in the example cited just above, his individuality remains as clearly marked. As has been pointed out before, Surrey's fifth line far surpasses the original, and his third line adds a pleasing change to Petrarch's conceit.<sup>23</sup> Surrey's competent handling of the sonnet form, however, is not confined to his adaptations from Petrarch; his original sonnets are well conceived and skillfully executed, as is demonstrated by:

When Windsor walles susteyned my wearied arme,  
 My hande, my chin, to ease my restlesse hed:  
 The pleasant plot reuested green with warme,  
 The blossomd bowes with lusty Ver yspred,  
 The flowred meades, the wedded birdes so late  
 Mine eyes discover: and to my mynde resorte  
 The ioly woes, the hatelesse shorte debate,  
 The rakehell lyfe that longes to loues disporte.  
 Wherewith (alas) the heauy charge of care  
 Heapt in my brest breakes forth against my will,  
 In smoky sighes, that ouercast the ayer.  
 My vapord eyes suche drery teares distill,  
 The tender spring whiche quicken where they fall;  
 And I halfe bent to throwe me downe withall.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Arber, p. 10.

<sup>23</sup> Other verses in which Surrey has improved upon Petrarch's lines are:  
 Chè bel fin fa chi ben amando more. (*Le Rime*, no. 140; l. 14)  
 Swete is his death, that takes his end by loue. ("Love that liveth," l. 14; Arber, p. 9.)

Si me governa il velo,  
 Che per mia morte et al caldo et al gelo  
 De' be' vostri occhi il dolce lume adombra. (*Le Rime*, no. 11; ll. 12-14)  
 So dothe this cornet gouerne me alacke:  
 In somer, sunne; in winters breath, a frost;  
 Wherby the light of her faire lokes I lost. ("I neuer sawe," ll. 12-14; Arber, p. 12.)

<sup>24</sup> Arber, p. 11.

Surrey's metrical experimentation caused him to cast his verses into a wide variety of forms. In addition to the sonnet he wrote:

1. Four-line stanzas:
  - a. Four-stress iambic verses riming abab:
    - 1) "When youth had led me halfe the race."
    - 2) "As oft as I behold and se."
  - b. Five-stress iambic verses riming abab:
    - 1) "So cruell prison how coulede betide, alas."
    - 2) "Wyat resteth here, that quicke coulede neuer rest."
  - c. Alternate four- and three-stress iambic verses riming abab:
    - 1) "Phylida was a fayer mayde."<sup>25</sup>
2. Six-line stanzas:
  - a. Four-stress iambic verses riming ababcc:
    - 1) "When ragyng loue with extreme payne."
    - 2) "Geue place ye louers, here before."
    - 3) "Syns fortunes wrath enuieth the welth."
  - b. Five-stress iambic verses riming ababcc:
    - 1) "My Ratclif, when thy rechlesse youth offendes."
3. Seven-line stanzas:
  - a. Iambic verses having stresses of 4, 3, 4, 3, 4, 4, 5 & riming ababccc:
    - 1) "O happy dames, that may embrace."
4. Eight-line stanzas:
  - a. Three-stress iambic verses riming ababdcdd:<sup>26</sup>
    - 1) "Although I had a check."
    - 2) "Though I regarded not."
    - 3) "O lothsome place where I."
  - b. Five-stress iambic verses riming abababcc (ottava rima):
    - 1) "Wher recheles youthe in a vnquiet brest."
    - 2) "Yf he that erst the fourme so livelye drewe."
5. Twelve-line stanzas:
  - a. Five-stress iambic verses riming abab abab abcc:
    - 1) "The soudden stormes that heaue me to and froo."

<sup>25</sup> It is questionable that this was written by Surrey. *Tottel's Miscellany* prints it under "Vncertain auctours"; *England's Helicon*, of 1600, attributes it to Surrey.

<sup>26</sup> Possibly these were composed in four-line stanzas.

6. Sixteen-line stanzas:
  - a. Four-stress iambic verses riming abab cdcd efef ghgh:
    - 1) "My friend, the things that do attain."<sup>27</sup>
7. Seventeen-line stanzas:
  - a. Five-stress iambic verses riming abababa cdcdcdcd ee:
    - 1) "The stormes are past these cloudes are ouerblowne."
8. Twenty-line stanza:
  - a. Five-stress iambic verses riming abab cdcd efef ghgh ijij:
    - 1) "Of thy lyfe, Thomas, this compasse well mark."<sup>28</sup>
9. Terza rima:
  - a. Four-stress iambic verses:
    - 1) "London, has thow accused me" (lines 29-40 not in terza rima).
  - b. Five-stress iambic verses:
    - 1) "The sonne hath twice brought furth his tender grene."
10. Poulter's measure, alternating iambic verses of six and seven stresses and riming in couplets.
  - a. Eleven poems and Surrey's translations from the Bible, with the exception of Psalm 55.
11. Unrimed verses:
  - a. Six-stress iambic verses without rime:
    - 1) The paraphrase of Psalm 55.
  - b. Five-stress iambic verses without rime (blank verse):
    - 1) The translations of Books II & IV of Virgil's *Aeneid*.

The extent of Surrey's experimentation in the use of the iambic verse is revealed by a glance through this list of his metrical forms, which makes apparent his preference for simplified rime-schemes and his fondness for ending his stanzas with couplets. The list makes apparent, also, that although he was studying the Italian Renaissance poetry and under its influence attempting to find new poetic forms and to improve English metrical usage, he did not restrict himself to experimenting only with foreign forms.

<sup>27</sup> Perhaps this should be considered four stanzas of four lines each.

<sup>28</sup> Possibly this should be considered five stanzas of four lines each.

The "poulter's measure,"<sup>29</sup> into which Surrey cast so much of his verse, was a native English form. Intermingling verses of six and seven stresses were common even in the poetry of the Middle English Period, but it was not until Sir Thomas Wyatt began the regular alternations of alexandrines and septemaries that the poulter's measure became a fixed poetic form.<sup>30</sup> Its precise derivation is unknown, but Saintsbury<sup>31</sup> suggests that the simplest explanation of its origin is

that which takes it as a modified ballad quatrain re-reduced to long instead of short lines, regularising the licence of six for eight in the first hemistich, cutting down the requirement of rhyme to the very lowest possible terms, and rejecting the presence of the trisyllabic equivalence.

This measure—which in the hands of so many mediocre poets can and did become a monotonous jog-trot, a compromise between literary and popular verse<sup>32</sup>—Surrey found pleasing, and he demonstrated its possibilities. Not only did he use it in several of his love poems; he wrote his most serious poetic expression—his translations from the Bible—in the poulter's measure and proved that in skilled hands it can be lyrical in quality and an expressive medium for narration and description.<sup>33</sup>

By far the most important of Surrey's contributions to Eng-

<sup>29</sup> So named by George Gascoigne in *Certain Notes of Instruction*, 1575 (*English Reprints*, London, 1868, p. 39): "And the commonest sort of verse which we vse now adayes (viz. the long verse of twelue and fourtene sillables) I know not certainly howe to name it, vnlesse I should say that it doth consist of Poulters measure, which giueth xii for one dozen and xiiij for another. But let this suffice (if it be not to much) for the sundrie sortes of verse which we vse now adayes."

<sup>30</sup> A. K. Foxwell, *A Study of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poems*, p. 107. R.M. Alden, *English Verse* (New York, 1925), p. 265, writes of the poulter's measure, "Schipper says that he does not know who first brought the two measures together in alternate use for lyrical poetry. Guest says that the Poulter's Measure came into fashion soon after 1500, but gives no examples so early."

<sup>31</sup> H. H. Child, *CHEL*, III, 200, "While in feeble hands [the poulter's measure] can become a monotonous jog-trot, it is lyrical in quality, and has in Wyatt's hands a strength, in Surrey's an elegance, and in Southwell's a brilliance, which should redeem it from total condemnation."

<sup>32</sup> As examples of the varied matter which Surrey could express effectively in this form, compare "Eche beast can chose hys fere" (Arber, p. 218), "Layd in my quiet bed," (Arber, p. 30), "Good Ladies, ye that haue" (Arber, p. 19), "Wrapt in my carelesse cloke" (Arber, p. 26), and his translations from the Bible.



lish metrics, however, was a new metrical form—the unrimed pentameter line, English blank verse, the meter in which much of the noblest poetry in our language has been written. The source from which it derived was *verso scioltto*,<sup>34</sup> which became a current poetic form in Italy in the first half of the sixteenth century. Directly or indirectly its influence contributed to the appearance of similar metrical forms in the poetry of other languages. Upon Surrey its influence seems to have been direct, and several possible sources from which he derived his blank verse and translated Books II and IV of Virgil's *Aeneid* have been suggested by scholars, who usually attempt to assign both matter and form to a single source. That Surrey had adapted blank verse from the work of Trissino was the common opinion<sup>35</sup> until Nott<sup>36</sup> pointed out that the first publication of Trissino's *Italia Liberata* was in 1547. Nott suggested that Surrey may have derived the idea from "a translation of the same books of Virgil into blank verse by Cardinal Hippolito de Medici, or as some say by Molaz."<sup>37</sup> . . . But," adds Nott, ". . . there is no similarity whatever in style or turn of expression between the two translations."<sup>38</sup> To the contrary, Professor Padelford believes that Surrey's translation of Book II of the *Aeneid* shows frequent indebtedness to the translation by Cardinal Hippolito and states also:

[Surrey's] fourth book is obviously indebted to the Italian version in blank verse by Nicolo Liburnio published in 1534, and . . . this translation owes little if anything at all to the translation by Piccolomini which appeared in the 1540 volume [*I Sei Primi Libri del Eneide*].<sup>39</sup>

Professor Berdan has suggested that the similarity between the Italian translations of the *Aeneid* and Surrey's can possibly be

<sup>34</sup> This is my opinion; one must, of course, consider the three possibilities discussed in Berdan, pp. 353-360.

<sup>35</sup> Thomas Warton, *Hist. of Eng. Poetry* (London, 1781), III, 25; also *Athenae Oxonienses* (ed. 1813) I, 160, Bliss's addition, "It has been remarked to me, by Mr. Conybeare, that Trissino was the Italian author whom Surrey probably followed in his adaptation of blank verse."

<sup>36</sup> Pp. cc.

<sup>37</sup> This was printed in 1539 as a separate volume; in 1540 was published *I Sei Primi Libri Del Eneide di Vergilio*, which contained the translation of *Libro Secondo di Vergilio di Hipolito de Medici Cardinale* and *Il Quarto Libro di Vergilio di M. Bartolameo Cierli Piccolomini*.

<sup>38</sup> Nott, p. cc.

<sup>39</sup> Padelford, p. 233.

explained as the influence of a common source in the annotated editions of Virgil which appeared almost every year at that time.<sup>40</sup> After reviewing these conjectures, Mr. Herbert Hartman<sup>41</sup> has decided, "It becomes more and more demonstrable [that Surrey] had no recourse to earlier models . . . . His experiment, therefore, in unrhymed decasyllables . . . was the product of strictly English humanism." Such is the diversity of opinion, for it is difficult to speak with authority of an English translation's indebtedness to a translation into a foreign language of the same original.

That Surrey may have come into contact with the Italian *verso sciolto* earlier than such suggestions as the above indicate must, I think, be carefully considered.<sup>42</sup> During Surrey's sojourn at the French court in 1532/33 Luigi Alamanni<sup>43</sup> brought out his *Opere Toscane*, dedicated to Francis I.<sup>44</sup> "This was a collection of sonnets, balades, and other amatory poems in rhyme; eclogues after the manner of Theocritus, and many other poems in blank verse; hymns in imitation of Pindar, the first of their kind; the penitential Psalms; and satires in terza rima."<sup>45</sup> As this book was published when its author and Surrey were both residing at the French Court, it seems impossible that one having Surrey's keen interest in Italian literature would not have seen it. If it be necessary to speculate concerning a single Italian source which caused Surrey to write English blank verse, *Opere Toscane* seems to be the most probable.

We must, nevertheless, remember that the age in which Surrey wrote was the age of the translation of the classics into the "vulgar tongues." Gawin Douglas's translation of the

<sup>40</sup> Berdan, p. 537.

<sup>41</sup> *Surrey's Fourth Boke of Virgill* (Purchase, New York, 1933), p. xxvi.

<sup>42</sup> This conclusion is advanced by Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in England* (New York, 1910), pp. 115-120, and noted by Berdan, p. 353.

<sup>43</sup> He was a Florentine poet, born in 1495, who was exiled from Italy for joining a plot to kill the Cardinal Guelio de Medici. He then spent some years at the court of Francis I.

<sup>44</sup> Luigi Alamanni, *Opere Toscane, al Christ. re Francesco Primo*, Firenze (Giunti), 1532.

<sup>45</sup> Henry Morley, *First Sketch of Eng. Lit.* (London, 1912), p. 289.

*Aeneid* was completed in 1513,<sup>46</sup> and although not printed until 1553, it undoubtedly circulated in manuscript.<sup>47</sup> It seems evident from a comparison of the two translations that Surrey was acquainted with Douglas's translation before writing his own,<sup>48</sup> but his work is indebted to Douglas's only in details of translation. Douglas's version is familiar and diffuse. In translating Virgil, as well as in translating Petrarch, Surrey sought to retain the spirit of his original, and his version is in the elevated and concise style of the Latin *Aeneid*. Not from a specific work did Surrey derive either his matter or his form in translating Books II and IV of Virgil's *Aeneid*. He was writing under the influence of the Renaissance.

Any technical criticism of Surrey's blank verse must necessarily be tentative, for no authoritative text exists or is likely to exist unless a holograph manuscript is discovered. Such is the state of the text that Nott<sup>49</sup> was able to cite passages to support his hypothesis that Surrey first wrote his translations from the *Aeneid* in unrimed alexandrines.<sup>50</sup> As evidence he cited two lines (431 & 1019) of Book II and three lines (30, 72, & 802) of Book IV as having twelve syllables, but such evidence is of little value. In Book II these two are the only lines which do contain twelve syllables, and in Book IV all three of the lines cited have variations between Tottel's edition of Surrey's blank verse and the version edited by Professor Padelford from B.M., Hargrave MS. 205. As Nott admits, Surrey's blank verse must have circulated widely in manuscript before it was posthumously printed. This circumstance leads inevitably to the con-

<sup>46</sup> Douglas says in his epilogue (ed. 1553, fol. ccclxxxv) that he completed his translation

Apoun the feist of Marye Magdelane,  
Fra Cristis birth, the date quha list to here,  
Ane thousand fyve hundreth and threttene zere [22 July, 1513].

<sup>47</sup> Lauchlan M. Watt, *Douglas's Aeneid* (Cambridge, 1920), p. 9.

<sup>48</sup> Nott, pp. cciii-ccix, was the first to note the similarities in Douglas's and Surrey's translations; for a comparison of the two texts see Nott, pp. 225\*-228\*\*; also the discussions by Miss M. M. Gray and Miss Edith Bannister in *Times Lit. Sup.*, 3 & 24 October & 7 November, 1936.

<sup>49</sup> Nott, p. cc.

<sup>50</sup> This hypothesis was suggested to Nott by William Webbe's *Discourse of English Poetry*, 1586, signature H<sub>1</sub>, where Webbe comments on Surrey's six-stress unrimed verse, but it is not clear that Webbe referred to Surrey's translation from the *Aeneid*; the passage may refer to Surrey's paraphrase of Psalm 55.

clusion that many passages have come down to us in a form never conceived by Surrey and negates Nott's slight evidence that the lines were first written in unrimed alexandrines.

In spite of the uncertainty of the text, perhaps some few tentative conclusions concerning Surrey's manner of writing blank verse are worth drawing. His fondness for using the initial trochee, especially when introducing a verse with a proper name, seems beyond dispute, and in his verse trochees as second feet (sometimes preceded or followed by another trochee) are not uncommon, while examples of their use in the last three feet can be found. Of the anapest and the spondee he makes use, but much less frequently.<sup>51</sup> Although his most common pause is after the fourth syllable, he uses the *cæsura* with the greatest freedom;<sup>52</sup> and it is possible to find examples of his pause falling after every syllable except the first,<sup>53</sup> where he at times uses a secondary pause.<sup>54</sup> Though his use of the broken-line seems to be confined to imitation of Virgil's broken-lines,<sup>55</sup> almost one-fourth of his verses are run-on lines.<sup>56</sup> Typical of his style in blank verse, as well as illustrative of his descriptive and dramatic power, are the following quotations:

With this the skie gan whirle about the sphere;  
The cloudy night gan thicken from the sea,  
With mantells spred that cloked earth and skies,  
And eke the treason of the Grekish guile.  
The watchemen lay disperst, to take their rest,  
Whoes worried limes sound slepe had then opprest.  
When, well in order comes the Grecian fleet  
From Tenedon, toward the costes well knowne,  
By frendly silence of the quiet moone. (II; 316-324).<sup>57</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Padelford, p. 234, cites nine anapests in Book II, but all of these except three (II, 62, 245, 755) depend upon the pronunciation of proper names; he also cites lines 333, 638, 1012 as amphibrachs, two of which depend on the pronunciation of proper names.

<sup>52</sup> Padelford, p. 51, has computed that in Surrey's blank verse the *cæsura* falls after the second foot in fifty per cent of the lines and after the fourth foot in thirty per cent.

<sup>53</sup> Such a sequence is II, 253; II, 541; II, 524; II, 664; II, 271; II, 256; IV, 353; II, 248.

<sup>54</sup> For instance: IV, 553 (Padelford, p. 168).

<sup>55</sup> Joseph B. Mayor, *Chapters on English Metre* (London, 1886), p. 139, cites IV, 292 as one unfinished line by Surrey which does not follow Virgil's usage; although in Tottel's version this line has but eight syllables, in the Hargrave MS. version (l. 291) it has ten.

<sup>56</sup> Padelford, p. 51.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 123.

Whoso thou art, learn to forget the Grekes;  
 Hencefourth be oures; and answeere me with truth:  
 Whereto was wrought the masse of this huge hors?  
 Whoes the devise? and wherto should it tend?  
 What holly vow? or engin for the warres? (II; 186-190).<sup>58</sup>

Swete spoiles, whiles God and destenies it wold,  
 Receue this sprite, and rid me of these cares!  
 I liued and ranne the course fortune did graunt,  
 And vnder earth my great gost now shall wende,  
 A goodly town I built, and saw my walles,  
 Happy, alas, to happy, if these costes  
 The Troyan shippes had neuer touched aye! (IV; 871-877).<sup>59</sup>

Any analysis of our present text of Surrey's blank verse can lead, however, but to one conclusion. He was experimenting with a new medium, trying to assemble pieces found here, there, and everywhere into a metrical conveyance. The pieces he selected wisely—making use of the trochee (initial or within the line), the anapest, the irregular foot, the shifting cæsure, the run-on line, and the broken line—but not until his successors had tinkered with the conveyance did the greatness and the infinite possibilities of this English vehicle become indisputable.

The phrase "polite verse" has been used in writing of Surrey's poetry.<sup>60</sup> This term is most appropriate for all the verse Surrey wrote prior to his imprisonment just before being executed. Polite verse it is, although often spirited and animated and—especially in his descriptions of nature—occasionally perhaps more expressive of himself than the poet intended. That this should be so is natural, but too often neglected in reading his poetry. Surrey was an aristocrat writing poetry when poetry—"vulgar poesie" at least—was not yet of sufficient importance to the English aristocracy to need to be defended. Although in the first half of the sixteenth century a few clerics took literature seriously (and themselves wrote almost entirely in Latin), for the most part Englishmen, nobles and commoners alike, were quite willing that the literary treasures of the monasteries should be used for wrapping paper. As for writing verse in English, the nobility then probably looked upon it as, at the be-

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 184.<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

ginning of the twentieth century, the English nobility looked upon automobile racing—an amusing diversion, proficiency in which could be admired but not taken seriously. Although self-consciousness was not then the curse it has since become, one of Surrey's breeding would feel (until he forgot himself in facing death) that it was beneath his dignity to reveal his true emotions to all those who might read his verses. He was not a romantic poet pouring out his soul for the edification of less sensitive spirits and the enrichment of his own purse. His verses, except perhaps for his translations from the Bible, were produced as a cultivated accomplishment; they were written as exercises which enabled him to occupy time of enforced inactivity, as a means of passing the time until he could devote himself to activities of true significance—to activities such as war, collecting taxes, or building a house.

The destruction of the tradition of Surrey's love for the Faïre Geraldine furnishes an excellent warning against those who would have us believe that Surrey was expressing more than "polite" sentiments in his love poetry. Undoubtedly Surrey addressed one sonnet, "From Tuskanne came my Ladies worthy race,"<sup>61</sup> to the lady who in the eighteenth century was tentatively identified as Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald, third wife of Edward Clinton, Earl of Lincoln; for the first edition of Holinshead's *Chronicle*,<sup>62</sup> 1577, published while Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald was yet alive, tells us that the Fitzgerald "family is very properly toucht in a Sonet of Surreys, made vpon the Erle of Kildares sister, now Countesse of Lincolne. [The sonnet is printed in full.] Upon the basis of this one sonnet, for which I cite the only conclusive external evidence of a love poem of Surrey's being addressed to a specific person, was built the literary tradition of Surrey's love for the Faïre Geraldine—a tradition which has distorted the interpretation of his verses until the modern day.<sup>63</sup> Surrey did write a sonnet to a little girl of nine whom he tells us that he first saw at Hunsdon in attendance upon Henry VIII's daughters. But the entire tradition of

<sup>61</sup> Arber, p. 9.

<sup>62</sup> Vol. I, "Description of Ireland," by Richard Stanyhurst, ch. VI, p. 19.

<sup>63</sup> So great has been the influence of this tradition upon criticism of Surrey's poetry that I include an appendix to trace its history.

Surrey's love for the subject of this sonnet is fallacious. Not only is there no acceptable evidence that any other of his poems was addressed to her, but this sonnet has no element of true emotion in it. It is a clever compliment in verse, but certainly no impassioned lover wrote the last two lines of the sonnet:

Her beauty of kind, her vertues from aboue;  
Happy is he that can obtaine her loue.<sup>64</sup>

Now that we can refuse to be influenced by the misleading tradition of Surrey's idyllic, or passionate, love for the *Faire Geraldine* we can realize that Surrey's poetry of love was written in the conventional, panegyric manner which was to be so prevalent in Elizabethan England—a manner well exemplified by Surrey's poem beginning:

Geue place ye louers, here before  
That spent your bostes and bragges in vaine:  
My Ladies beawtie passeth more  
The best of yours, I dare well sayen,  
Than doth the sonne, the candle light:  
Or brightest day, the darkest night.<sup>65</sup>

As an example of Surrey's amatory verse, this is one of the most obviously "polite" of his poems, but careful unbiased reading will reveal that all of his poems of love, excluding perhaps those addressed to his wife, are in this spirit. Surrey is writing about love, not versifying his own passion. The verses to his wife<sup>66</sup> may have a note of truer emotion in them, but it is not so great that they can be called other than polite verse.

"The sonne hath twice brought furth his tender grene"<sup>67</sup> exemplifies Surrey's use of the five stress terza rima and reveals the combination of the influences upon him of Chaucer and Petrarch. Perhaps "The great Macedon, that out of Persie

<sup>64</sup> Arber, p. 10.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>66</sup> "Good Ladies, ye that haue" (Arber, p. 19) contains internal evidence that it was addressed to the Countess of Surrey; "O Happy dames, that may embrace" (Arber, p. 15) may have been to the Countess of Surrey, or perhaps to Mary Skelton, the sweetheart of Thomas Clere (see Padelford, p. 215); the circumstances described in "The fansy which that I haue serued long" (Arber, p. 32) suggest that it was written to his wife, but there is ample proof that Surrey did not "in base Bullayn . . . remayn against [his] will" (see above, ch. VIII).

<sup>67</sup> Arber, p. 3.

chased"<sup>68</sup> and "Th'Assirian king in peace, with foule desire"<sup>69</sup> should be mentioned as typifying the limited influence of the classics upon his verse, for such influence as they had was confined to subject matter and did not affect his forms.<sup>70</sup> Though he drew conceits often from classical mythology, many of these seem to be derived through Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*.

Surrey's descriptive poems, many of which offer autobiographical references, seem less "polite"; nevertheless, that they should be accepted as sincere expressions of the poet's true feelings is extremely dubious. "When Windsor walles susteyned my wearied arme"<sup>71</sup> is a good sonnet, but it is also a much dramatized memoir of the author's life at Windsor Castle. The oxymora are poetically effective, as is the verse "The rakehell lyfe that longes to lous disporte," but the authenticity of such autobiographical allusions is questionable. "So cruell prison, how coulede betide, alas"<sup>72</sup> may be a more sincere expression of the poet in idealizing his friendship for the Duke of Richmond, but its foundation upon the unnaturally mature experiences of these young boys gives it an undercurrent of poetic fiction. It reflects the life of the contemporary court more than the poet's individual experience. The satire on London, "London, hast thow accused me,"<sup>73</sup> is an amusing criticism but unconvincing as an outburst of outraged feelings. The writer, with curled lips and twinkling eyes, is ironically and insincerely offering an excuse for his waywardness. "Eche beast can chose hys fere"<sup>74</sup>—the poem which it has been supposed Surrey wrote in anger against a lady who refused to dance with him, although the allegory admits various other interpretations<sup>75</sup>—is less an outburst of anger than an example of an old form of satire in which the writer professes disdain and exhibits his cleverness. His tributes to Wyatt are, perhaps, sincere, but they are merely conventionally elegiac praises—any of which might well have been written on the death of any prominent man by a poet having only a slight knowledge of his subject.<sup>76</sup> In his tribute to Thomas Clere<sup>77</sup> the poet shows a much more intimate knowl-

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Berdan, p. 530.

<sup>71</sup> Arber, p. 11.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>73</sup> Padelford, p. 85.

<sup>74</sup> Arber, p. 218.

<sup>75</sup> See above, ch. V, note 42 (p. 92).

<sup>76</sup> See above, ch. V, xi (p. 94).

<sup>77</sup> See above, pp. 123-124.



edge of his subject, and the circumstances which caused it to be written offer excellent external evidence that this is a sincere poetical expression of Surrey's emotion; yet the restraint exhibited here and the similarity of the treatment to that in "From Tuskane came my Ladies worthy race" strongly suggest the mood in which Surrey habitually wrote.

But his attitude seems to have changed when he undertook to treat Biblical material. Although external evidence is lacking of the date which he did so, his prologues to Psalms 73 & 88 strongly supplement the internal evidence that Surrey composed his paraphrases from the penitential Psalms<sup>78</sup> and the first five chapters of Ecclesiastes while in prison and knowing that his execution could not be for long postponed. The tone of these paraphrases and their variations from the original reveal so clear a realization of the unreliability of friends, the malice of enemies, and the uncertainty of temporal position that it seems necessary to accept them as an exposition of the poet's own beliefs—beliefs which Surrey certainly had not held during his life previous to his final attainder. So extremely free is the translation that the verses describe Tudor England and the characters alluded to can often be tentatively identified as persons who had a place in Surrey's life.<sup>79</sup> If in writing verse Surrey permitted himself to make poetry of his own thoughts and feelings, it was in these Biblical paraphrases.<sup>80</sup>

Not by the intrinsic merit of his poetry, however, does Surrey retain his place in the history of English literature. Only in translating Martial's epigram into "My friend, the things that do attain"<sup>81</sup> did he write an English translation which has called forth the comment, "It may be doubted whether Surrey's translation was ever surpassed."<sup>82</sup> In original composition, at least once even Wyatt wrote a lyric<sup>83</sup> which we treasure more than any of Surrey's original verses. Nevertheless, if we com-

<sup>78</sup> With the exception of Psalm 8; see above, Ch. IX, note 53 (p. 208).

<sup>79</sup> See above, Ch. IX, x (pp. 207-210).

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>81</sup> J. William Hebel & Hoyt H. Hudson, *Poetry of the English Renaissance* (New York, 1929), p. 34. This is probably the second poem of Surrey's to find its way into print, for it was published in William Baldwin's *Treatise of Moral Philosophy* in 1547.

<sup>82</sup> Hebel & Hudson, *Poetry of the English Renaissance*, p. 917.

<sup>83</sup> I refer to "My lute, awake."

pare as a whole the work of these two precursors of Elizabethan poetry, we find that Surrey treated his foreign models with a much greater sense of discrimination than did Wyatt, and was able to create new poetic forms entirely consonant with our language; moreover, Surrey defined the poetic diction which was to be current for the next two centuries; he demonstrated how poetic translations should be made; and he established a new manner in amatory verse. In short, he did much to refine English poetic style and blazed clearly the way which led to the greatest of English literature.

## APPENDIX II

### THE TRADITION OF SURREY'S LOVE FOR THE FAIRE GERALDINE.

"The legend of Surrey's devotion to the Fair Geraldine," wrote W. J. Courthope in 1897 in his *History of English Poetry*,<sup>1</sup> "is one of those traditions which take deep root in literature, and which survive vaguely in the mind of a nation, long after criticism has destroyed the grounds on which they rest." He then inadvertently illustrated the truth of his statement, for in spite of the complete lack of acceptable evidence that Surrey addressed more than a single sonnet to this young lady, Courthope continued, on the next page but one, "That Elizabeth Fitz-Gerald is the subject of many, if not all, Surrey's love poems is certain."

Courthope's statements are at least apparently paradoxical and well exemplify the influence that continues to be exerted by the fallacious tradition of Surrey's love for the Faire Geraldine—a tradition which originated at the end of the sixteenth century. *The Arte of English Poesie*, 1589,<sup>2</sup> contained the statement, "Sir Thomas Wyat th'elder and Henry Earle of Surrey . . . hauing trauailed into Italie . . . greatly polished our rude & homely maner of vulgar Poesie." It seems probable that some form of this misstatement (possibly intended as a metaphor only) suggested to Thomas Nash the plot of his *Unfortunate Traveller*, 1594.<sup>3</sup> In this purely fictitious narrative Nash has Surrey visit Italy and successfully defend the beauty of his Faire Geraldine in a tourney at Florence.<sup>4</sup> From Nash's account Michael Drayton must have drawn the material upon which he composed two additional poems for his *Heroicall Epistles*,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vol. II, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> P. 48.

<sup>3</sup> This was entered on the Stationers' Register on 17 September, 1593.

<sup>4</sup> The anachronisms and fictions of this work have been excellently demonstrated by Alexander Chalmers, *The Works of the English Poets* (London, 1810), II, 316-320, and by Nott, pp. xxxviii-xlii, and are now generally recognized.

<sup>5</sup> The first edition (1597) did not contain these poems; Surrey's "epistle" to Geraldine was first printed in the 1598 edition; her reply in the 1599 edition. Dray-

but to these he gave the appearance of historical authenticity by prefixing to Surrey's "epistle" this argument:<sup>6</sup>

Henry Howard, that true noble Earl of Surrey, an excellent Poet, falling in loue with Geraldine; descended of the noble family of the Fitzgeralds of Ireland, a faire and modest Lady; and one of the honorable maydes to Queen Katherine Dowager: eternizeth her prayes in many excellent Poems, of rare and sundry inuentions: and after some fewe yeares, being determined to see that famous Italy, the source and Helicon of al excellent Arts; first visiteth that renowned Florence, from whence the Geraldts challenge their descent, from the ancient family of the Geraldts: there in honor of his mistresse he aduanceth her picture: and challengeth to maintaine her beauty by deedes of Armes against all that durst appeare in the lists, where after the prooffe of his braue and incomparable valour, whose arme crowned her beauty with eternall memory, he writeth this Epistle to his dearest Mistris.

During the greater part of the seventeenth century, when little was written about Surrey or his poetry, the fictitious exploits attributed to him by Nash seem to have been little known. In 1675 Edward Phillips<sup>7</sup> in a commentary on Surrey merely mentioned that an English writer of the time had written that Henry Howard (and Wyatt) had travelled into Italy and brought back the Italian style. Twelve years later, however, William Winstanley's *Lives of the Most Famous English Poets*<sup>8</sup> again printed the elaborated story, citing Drayton as its source. A more important work to add currency and lend authority to Nash's invention was the second edition of *Athenæ Oxonienses*; although in the first edition Surrey is merely mentioned in the article on Sir Thomas Wyatt as having travelled into Italy, the edition of 1721<sup>9</sup> contains an account of Surrey's fictitious journey, with many of its embellishments. It cites Drayton as an authority, but fails to mention the ultimate source.

---

ton's notes, 1598 edition, p. 89, prove that *The Unfortunate Traveller*, was his source. <sup>6</sup> Edition of 1598, p. 86.

<sup>7</sup> *Theatrum Poetarum*, p. 97. This "English writer of the time" would seem to be the author of *The Arte of English Poesie*.

<sup>8</sup> P. 49 ff.; Nash is not mentioned as an authority, although it would seem that some of Winstanley's material was drawn from *The Unfortunate Traveller*.

<sup>9</sup> Vol. I, 68.

During the eighteenth century the literary tradition of Surrey's love for the Faire Geraldine became firmly established by the identification of the Geraldine to whom Surrey had addressed his sonnet beginning "From Tuskane came my Ladies worthy race" as Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald, daughter of Gerald Fitzgerald, 10th Earl of Kildare. The preface<sup>10</sup> of Sewell's edition of Surrey's poems, published in 1717, states:

The lady to whom he [Surrey] addressed them [his love poems] was of the Bedchamber to Queen Catherine, and the most celebrated beauty of her time; her name was Geraldine, whose Family originally came from Florence, and was transplanted into Ireland, where she was born.

Cibber's *Lives of the Poets*, 1753,<sup>11</sup> identifies her as a "Maid of Honour to Queene Catherine" and gives again the details of the legend of Surrey's visit to Italy. But three years previously, in 1750, Arthur Collins had published in his *Peerage*.

Lady Elizabeth [Fitzgerald], second Daughter [of the 9th Earl of Kildare by his second wife, the Lady Elizabeth Grey, fourth daughter of Thomas Marquis of Dorset], was the third and last wife of *Edward Lord Clinton*, created Earl of *Lincoln*; who [left] her a Widow, without Issue, January 16, 1584-85; . . . and on her Ladyship was composed this following Sonnet, by the Earl of Surrey [the sonnet is quoted].<sup>12</sup>

It would seem, however, that Horace Walpole's publication in 1758 of his identification of the Faire Geraldine played the greatest part in establishing the tradition of Surrey's legendary love for her. In the first edition of his *Royal and Noble Authors of England*<sup>13</sup> he wrote:

In imitation of Laura, our Earl [of Surrey] had his Geraldine. Who

<sup>10</sup> P. xii.

<sup>11</sup> Vol. I, pp. 47-53.

<sup>12</sup> *A Supplement to the Four Volumes of the Peerage of England*, by Arthur Collins, vol. I of the *Supplement*, or vol. V of the entire *Peerage*, p. 354. Another peerage of the time, *The Peerage of Ireland*, by John Lodge, 1754, vol. I, 35, gives an account of the Earls of Kildare and their families in which Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald is mentioned, but no reference is made to her as the subject of any poem; in the preface (p. ix) Lodge states that he first printed an account of the Earls of Kildare in 1745 "as a Specimen of the Peerage of Ireland," but I have been unable to see a copy of this.

<sup>13</sup> Vol. I, pp. 88-94.

She was, we are not told directly; himself mentions several particulars relating to her, but not her name. . . . I think I have very nearly discovered who this fair Person was. . . . I am inclined to think that her poetical appellation was her real name, as every one of the circumstances tally. Gerald Fitzgerald, Earl of Kildare, in the reign of Henry the eighth, married to his second Wife, Margaret,<sup>13a</sup> Daughter of Thomas Gray Marquiss of Dorset; by whom He had three Daughters, Lady Margaret, who was born deaf and dumb (probably not the fair Geraldine), Elizabeth, third Wife of Edward Clinton, Earl of Lincoln, and the Lady Cicely. Our genealogists say, that the Family of Fitzgerald derives its origine from Otho, descended from the Dukes of Tuscany, who in the reign of King Alfred settled in England, and from thence transplanted themselves into Ireland. Thus "From Tuscan came his Lady's noble race." Her Sire an Earl, and her being fostered with milk of Irish breast, follow of course. Her Dame being of Prince's blood is as exact; Thomas, Marquiss of Dorset, being Son of Queen Elizabeth Gray, Daughter of the Duchess of Bedford, of the princely House of Luxemburg. The only question is whether the Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald or her Sister Lady Cicely was the fair Geraldine: I should think the former, as it is evident She was settled in England.

For the acceptance and dissemination of this identification external evidence was not, apparently, considered necessary. Although in a note in the 1792 edition<sup>14</sup> of this work Walpole announces, "Since the first edition, I have been told that Hollinshed confirms my supposition," no effort was made—or has been made until now—to bring forward this conclusive evidence.<sup>15</sup> Walpole's informant was correct. The first edition of Holinshed's *Chronicle*, published while Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald was yet living, states that the Fitzgerald "family is very properly toucht in a Sonet of Surreys, made vpon the Erle of Kildares sister, now Countesse of Lincolne. [The sonnet is printed in full.]"<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13a</sup> Mistake for Elizabeth.

<sup>14</sup> Vol. I, p. 110.

<sup>15</sup> H. E. Rollins, *Tottel's Miscellany* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928-29), II, p. 71, does contain the following, "Further countenance was given to the rumor [of Surrey's alleged connection with 'Geraldine'] by Richard Stanyhurst in the description of Ireland . . . in Holinshed's *Chronicle*."

<sup>16</sup> Holinshed, first edition, 1577, vol. I "Description of Ireland," by Richard Stanyhurst, ch. VI, p. 19.

Thomas Warton was willing to accept both the legend and Walpole's identification of the lady. In his *History of English Poetry*, 1781,<sup>17</sup> he wrote:

It is not precisely known at what period the earl of Surrey began his travels. They have the air of a romance. He made the tour of Europe in the true spirit of chivalry, and with the ideas of an Amadis; proclaiming the unparalleled charms of his mistress, and prepared to defend the cause of her beauty with the weapons of knight-errantry.

Citing Walpole's deduction, Warton declares that the Faire Geraldine was undoubtedly one of the daughters of Gerald Fitzgerald, Earl of Kildare.<sup>18</sup>

So firmly was the tradition established by the end of the eighteenth century that proving its posthumous birth was fathered by Nash's fiction could not make it illegitimate. Joseph Ritson discovered the evidence and disclosed it in his *Bibliographia Poetica* of 1802,<sup>19</sup> but the third edition of George Ellis's *Specimens*,<sup>20</sup> published the following year, contained the traditional account. In 1810 Alexander Chalmers<sup>21</sup> proclaimed that the source of the tradition was Drayton's *Heroicall Epistles* and that Drayton took his material from *The Unfortunate Traveller*; he also exposed the anachronisms contained in these accounts and cogently pointed out that the tradition of Surrey's love for the Faire Geraldine, originating from a fictitious narrative, was without foundation. Nevertheless, even G. F. Nott, who published his work on Surrey in 1815 and himself offered convincing evidence that Surrey had never visited Italy,<sup>22</sup> was so under the influence of the tradition that he interpreted all of Surrey's love poems as expressions of idyllic love for Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald.<sup>23</sup> Nott's preposterous interpretation was accepted and generally current up to the end of the nineteenth century,<sup>24</sup> when Edmond Bapst<sup>25</sup> demonstrated that, in so far

<sup>17</sup> Vol. III, p. 6.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3; see also pp. 2-12; 19-26.

<sup>19</sup> Pp. 248-50; because of his discovery he denied that the sonnet to Geraldine was written by Surrey.

<sup>20</sup> Vol. II, p. 54.

<sup>21</sup> *The Works of the English Poets*, II, 316-320.

<sup>22</sup> Nott, pp. xxxvii-xlv.

<sup>23</sup> Nott, throughout, but especially pp. cxvii-cxxv.

<sup>24</sup> The memoir in the Aldine edition of Surrey's poems, edited by J. Yeowell, 1831, contains the statement on p. xx, "One poem, and one poem only can, upon

as can be determined, Surrey had no relations with Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald other than seeing her as a young girl who was in attendance upon the King's daughters. But he too was misled by the tradition. Although he limited the duration of Surrey's infatuation, Bapst accepted the tradition that the young Earl was writing of the Faire Geraldine in many of his poems.<sup>26</sup> Courthope, we have noted above, insisted, "That Elizabeth Fitz-Gerald is the subject of many, if not all, Surrey's love poems is certain."

Only now are critics beginning to be able to reject this false belief. In 1909 Professor Harold H. Child could write, "These poems [to Geraldine], in fact, are the result, not of a sincere passion, but of the rules of the game of chivalry as played in its decrepitude and Surrey's youth."<sup>27</sup> But even here is an inaccuracy traceable to the influence of the tradition. Professor Child wrote "poems." Not until 1920, it seems, could anyone escape entirely the influence of the legend. Then at least two critics did so: Professor Padelford<sup>28</sup> commented, "The truth probably is that Surrey whiled away an idle hour of confinement by composing a sonnet in compliment to a little girl of nine whose pretty face chanced to have caught his fancy." In the same year Professor Berdan<sup>29</sup> wrote, "It is quite clear that we have here the fancy of a lively lad of nineteen pleasuring a little girl." As both point out, this sonnet was probably written in 1537, when Surrey was nineteen or twenty years of age and Lady Elizabeth was only nine. It is not possible that a newly and happily married man could feel a violent love for a girl of nine years, even in that age of early maturity; but the tradition that Surrey loved the Faire Geraldine so ardently that he journeyed to Italy to spread her fame and eternalize her praises

---

anything like evidence, be supposed to have been addressed to the lady mentioned by the name of Geraldine." And Henry Howard of Corby, *Memorials*, p. 33, wrote, "I believe her [Geraldine] to be an imaginary person, a Phillis or Chloe, to whom and for whom the poet outpours the effusions of his fancy." This attitude, however, found little favor with other writers of the time.

<sup>26</sup> Bapst's *Deux gentilshommes-poètes* was published in 1891.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 365-370.

<sup>28</sup> *CHEL*, III, 198.

<sup>29</sup> *The Poems of Surrey*, edition of 1920, p. 189.

<sup>30</sup> *Early Tudor Poetry* (New York, 1920), p. 517.



has, for over three hundred years, so influenced the conception of the poet and the interpretation of his poetry that no one has seen fit to bring together all the accumulated evidence of its misleading effect.

To summarize: Surrey did address a sonnet in compliment to a young lady whom he called "Geraldine." During the eighteenth century she was correctly identified from internal evidence as Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald (as I have found external evidence to prove). Absolutely no acceptable evidence had been advanced that the Earl wrote more than this single sonnet to her or that this sonnet was more than a conventional compliment. These are the facts from which arose the fallacious tradition of Surrey's love for the Faire Geraldine.

## INDEX

(In this index page references to Surrey are given only under the entry "Surrey's poetry." Omitted also are page references to Henry VIII and to the third Duke of Norfolk (Surrey's father), since these names occur on almost every page. The titles and family names of Englishmen are cross-indexed, but references to others are entered only under the name or title by which they are referred to in the text. References in footnotes are not listed.)

- Abbot of Bury St Edmunds, see Reve, John.  
 Agello, Francisco (an Italian Captain), 165.  
 Alamanni, Luigi, 66, 235.  
 Alburquerque, Duke of (Bertrand de la Cueva), 110.  
 Alice or Alys (maid to Millicent Arundell), 99.  
 Angoulême, Duke of, see Charles of Valois.  
 Anne Boleyn (2nd wife of Henry VIII), 30, 31, 34-36, 38, 39, 43-46, 48, 53-56, 87.  
 Anne of Cleves (4th wife of Henry VIII), 73-77, 79-81.  
 Ansemori, Amerigo, 165.  
 Archbishop of Canterbury, see Cranmer & Warham.  
 Arden (a captain at Boulogne), 143, 169.  
 Arschot, Duke of (Philip de Croy), 103, 104.  
 Arthur Tudor (Prince of Wales), 33, 45, 53.  
 Arundel, Earl of, see Fitzalan, William.  
 Arundell, Millicent, 95-99.  
 Aslebye, Francis, 143.  
 Auber, Earl of Passy, 9.  
 Aumale, Count d' (François de Lorraine of Guise), 143.  
 Auxerre, Bishop of (Francis de Dinteville), 40.  
 Baker, Sir John, 206, 207.  
 Bapst, Edmund, 61, 62, 88, 99, 100, 248, 249.  
 Barker, Christopher (Garter King at Arms), 196, 197, 211.  
 Barlowe, John (Dean of Westbury), 3-5.  
 Basforde or Bashford (a captain at Boulogne), 156.  
 Becket, Thomas à, 70.  
 Bellay, Martin du, 125, 126.  
 Bellingham, Edward (gentleman of the Privy Chamber), 146, 147, 155.  
 Berdan, John, 234, 249.  
 Biez, Oudart du (Maréchal of France), 117, 119, 124, 126, 132, 152, 154.  
 Birch, William (Alderman), 98.  
 Blage, George, 97, 186-188.  
 Blount, Charles (Lord Mountjoy), 121.  
 Blount, Elizabeth, 32.  
 Boleyn, Anne, see Anne.  
 Boleyn, George (Viscount Rochford), 54.  
 Bonner, Edmund (Bishop of London), 111.  
 Botyer, Mons. de, 141.  
 Brandon, Charles (Duke of Suffolk), 33, 39, 55, 74, 119, 125, 128, 130, 160, 205.  
 Brandon, Henry (Duke of Suffolk), 185, 186.  
 Brenan, Gerald & Stathan, E. P., 127, 212.  
 Brereton, William, 54.  
 Broke, George (Lord Cobham), 162.  
 Bridges or Bryggys, Sir John (Lieutenant of Boulogne Castle), 140, 142, 155, 157.  
 Brotherton, Thomas of (Earl of Norfolk, younger son of Edward I), 21, 196, 213.  
 Browne, Sir Anthony, K. G., 206, 207.  
 Buckingham, Duke of, see Stafford, Edward.  
 Bulbeck, Baron, see Vere, John de.  
 Buren, Count of (Maximilian d'Egmont), 112, 118, 121, 124.

- Campeggio, Lorenzo (Cardinal), 30, 33, 45.
- Carew, Sir George, 103.
- Carew, Wyndham, 194, 195.
- Castell, Andrew (butcher), 96.
- Castillon, Sieur de (Louis de Perreau), 69.
- Catelyn or Catlin, 22.
- Catherine of Aragon (1st wife of Henry VIII), 30, 32, 33, 35, 38, 43-46, 51, 53.
- Catherine Howard (5th wife of Henry VIII), 29, 80, 81, 85-88.
- Catherine Parr (6th wife of Henry VIII), 102, 108.
- Cavendish, Sir Richard (Comptroller of Boulogne), 134, 157.
- Cellini, Benvenuto, 6.
- Chalmers, Alexander, 248.
- Chapuis, Eustache (Ambassador of Charles V), 31-32, 34-37, 43.
- Charles V, Emperor, 30, 31, 34-36, 38, 43, 52, 68, 71, 73-76, 79, 85, 86, 91, 102-105, 112, 116-118, 120, 123-125, 128.
- Charles of Valois (Duke d'Angoulême, then d'Orléans; 3rd son of Francis I), 40, 41.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, 200, 222, 240, 241.
- Cheyney, Sir Thomas, 118.
- Child, Harold H., 249.
- Chichester, Bishop of, see Sampson, Richard.
- Churchyard, Thomas, 110, 111.
- Cibber, Colley, 246.
- Clement VII, Pope, 28, 30, 38, 40-47.
- Clement (an Italian captain at Boulogne), 141.
- Clere, Sir John, 71, 97, 99.
- Clere, Thomas, 93, 97, 99, 121, 123, 124, 241, 242.
- Clerke, John, 27, 28, 84, 220-221.
- Cleves, William, Duke of, 73-75.
- Clinton, Edward (Earl of Lincoln), 239, 246.
- Cobham (a captain at Boulogne), 156.
- Cobham, Lord, see Broke, George.
- Collins, Arthur, 246.
- Constantyne, George, 3-5.
- Copeland, Thomas, 175-176.
- Cotton, Thomas (Vice-Admiral), 144.
- Coucy, Jacques de (see Vervins, Lord de).
- Courthope, W. J., 244, 249.
- Cranmer, Thomas (Archbishop of Canterbury), 44, 45, 54, 55, 74, 86, 183.
- Crayford (a captain at Boulogne), 156.
- Croft, James (Under-Marshal of Boulogne from 21 Mar., 1546), 171.
- Cromwell, Thomas, Lord, 18, 19, 40, 57, 60, 64, 68, 73, 74, 79, 80, 81, 224.
- Culpepper, Joyce (1st wife of Lord Edmund Howard & mother of Queen Catherine Howard), 80.
- Culpepper, Thomas, 86-87.
- Dampierre, Baron de (Claude de Clermont), 131.
- Darcy, Thomas, Lord, 60-61.
- Dauphin of France, see Francis de Valois & Henry de Valois.
- Derby, Earl of, see Stanley, Edward.
- Dereham, Francis, 86.
- Dethyke, Sir Gilbert (Richmond Herald), 196, 211.
- Dethyke, Sir William, 211.
- Devereux, Richard (son of Lord Ferrers), 200.
- Dorset, Marquis of, see Grey, Thomas.
- Douglas, Archibald (Earl of Angus), 56, 91.
- Douglas, Gawin, 235-236.
- Douglas, Lady Margaret, 56.
- Drayton, Michael, 244-245, 248.
- Dudley, Henry (Captain of the Guard at Boulogne), 156, 157.
- Dudley, Mr. (Henry?), 141, 142.
- Dudley, Sir John (Viscount Lisle, High Admiral of England, Captain of Boulogne, Sept. 1544-Jan. 1545), 77-78, 129, 143, 168, 181-182, 206-207.
- Durham, Bishop of, see Tunstall, Cuthbert.
- Edgar, King, 9.
- Edward the Confessor, 191, 196, 200-201, 205, 210-213, 216.
- Edward I, 16, 21, 213.
- Edward IV, 16.
- Edward, Prince (Edward VI), 55, 64, 73, 99, 178, 185-187, 189-191, 200-201, 205-206.

- Eleanor of Austra (2nd wife of Francis I), 41.  
 Elizabeth, Princess (Queen Elizabeth), 48, 53, 56, 183.  
 Ellis, George, 248.  
 Ellis, Hugh, 22, 200.  
 Ellerkar or Alderkar, Sir Ralph (Marshal of Boulogne), 140-141, 147, 154-157, 171.  
 Empress (wife of Charles V), see Isabella of Portugal.  
 Essex, Earl of, see Parr, William.  
 Étampes, Duchess of (Anne de Pis-seleu), 180, 197.  
 Fitzalan, Elizabeth (wife of Thomas Mowbray, 1st Duke of Norfolk), 213.  
 Fitzalan, William (11th Earl of Arundel), 39.  
 Fitzgerald, Lady Cicely, 247.  
 Fitzgerald, Lady Elizabeth (The Faire Geraldine; 3rd wife of Edward Clinton, Earl of Lincoln), 239-240, 244-250.  
 Fitzgerald, Gerald (9th Earl of Kildare), 246-248.  
 Fitzgerald, Lady Margaret, 247.  
 Fitzroy, Henry (Duke of Richmond), 17, 22, 23, 32-34, 37, 39-42, 46-49, 52, 57, 63, 68, 70, 241.  
 Fitz-Valerine, Roger, 9.  
 Fitzwilliam, Sir William (Earl of Southampton), 74, 83.  
 Flammock, Sir Andrew (Porter of Boulogne), 140, 170-172. (Mr. Porter?, 142, 155).  
 Foxwell, Ada K., 224, 226.  
 Francis I of France, 35, 38-43, 47, 52, 66, 68, 69, 71, 73, 75, 76, 79, 87, 91, 102, 105, 123, 127, 128-130, 133, 143, 148, 182.  
 Francis de Valois, Dauphin of France, 40, 41.  
 Fulmerston, Richard, 136, 200.  
 Gage, Sir John, 215.  
 Gardiner, Stephen (Bishop of Winchester), 80-81, 86, 160, 193, 204-205.  
 Gate, John, 194-195.  
 Geraldine, The Faire, see Fitzgerald, Lady Elizabeth.  
 Giles, Hugh, 147, 151.  
 Godolphin, Sir William, junior (Baillif of Boulogne), 165.  
 Gonzaga, Fernando de (Grand Master of Imperial forces), 104.  
 Granado, Jacques (a captain at Boulogne), 155.  
 Gressam or Gresham, Sir Richard, 97, 98.  
 Grey, Lady Elizabeth (da. of following entry & wife of Earl of Kildare), 246-247.  
 Grey, Thomas (2nd Marquis of Dorset), 246-247.  
 Grey of Wilton, William, 13th Baron, 130, 131, 138, 142-144, 165, 174-176, 181.  
 Grocyn, William, 28.  
 Guato, Pedro de, 107.  
 Hartman, Herbert, 235.  
 Harvey, Clarendieux king-at-arms, 9.  
 Harvy (a man at arms at Boulogne), 156.  
 Henry VII, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 32, 33, 53.  
 Henry de Valois (Duke d'Orléans, Dauphin of France, Henry II), 40-41, 124-125.  
 Herbert of Cherbury, Edward, Lord, 25, 215.  
 Hertford, Earl of, see Seymour, Edward.  
 Hevingham, Mrs., see Shelton, Mary.  
 Hoberthorn, Henry (Lord Mayor), 214.  
 Holinshed, Raphael, 239, 247.  
 Holland, Elizabeth, 19-20, 194-195, 199.  
 Holland, John, 19.  
 Howard, Catherine, see Catherine.  
 Howard, Charles (son of Lord Edmund), 29.  
 Howard, Lord Edmund (younger brother of 3rd Duke of Norfolk), 27, 29, 80.  
 Howard, George (son of Lord Edmund), 29.  
 Howard, Henry (Lord Howard 1517-1524; Earl of Surrey 1524-1547), in reference to his poetry see, Surrey's poetry.  
 Howard, Henry (son of Lord Edmund), 29.

- Howard, Henry (Surrey's 2nd son; Earl of Northampton), 23, 64, 179, 218-219 (also see note 82, pp. 218-219).
- Howard of Corby, Henry, 213.
- Howard, John (1st Duke of Norfolk), 11-13, 213.
- Howard, Mary (Duchess of Richmond), 17, 26, 33, 48, 57, 67, 68, 70, 135, 179-181, 194-195, 197-199, 201, 202, 211.
- Howard, Sir Robert (d. 1436), 11.
- Howard, Thomas (Earl of Surrey to 1514; 2nd Duke of Norfolk), 11-15, 18, 24-26, 205, 213.
- Howard, Thomas (Lord Thomas Howard to 1514; Earl of Surrey 1514-1524; 3rd Duke of Norfolk 1524-1559, throughout).
- Howard, Lord Thomas (half-brother to 3rd Duke), 29, 56.
- Howard, Lord Thomas (2nd son of 3rd Duke of Norfolk; Viscount Bindon), 93, 179.
- Howard, Thomas (Surrey's 1st son; 4th Duke of Norfolk), 50, 52, 53, 179 (also note 82, p. 218).
- Howard, Sir William (d. 1309), 9-11.
- Howard, Lord William (half-brother of 3rd Duke of Norfolk), 28, 87, 93, 121-122.
- Hussey of Sleaford, John, Lord, 19.
- Hussey, Thomas, 97, 135-138.
- Isabella of Portugal (wife of Charles V), 73.
- James IV of Scotland, 14-15, 56.
- James V of Scotland, 52, 56, 69, 93, 94.
- Jane Seymour (3rd wife of Henry VIII), 54, 55, 61, 64, 72.
- Jones (a captain at Boulogne), 156.
- Junius, Hadrian, 111-112.
- Kildare, Earl of, see Fitzgerald, Gerald.
- Knevet, Sir Edmund, 70-71, 197, 214.
- Latimer, John Nevill, Lord, 121.
- Leigh, John à, 88, 89, 91.
- Leland, John, 27.
- Liburnio, Nicolo, 234.
- Lilly, Henry (Rouge dragon), 9.
- Lincoln, Bishop of, see Longland, John.
- Lincoln, Earl of, see Pole, John de la & Clinton, Edward.
- Lisle, Viscount, see Dudley, Sir John.
- Lister, Sir Richard, 206-207.
- London, Bishop of, see Bonner, Edmund.
- Longland, John (Bishop of Lincoln), 86.
- Lorraine, Francis de (Count d'Aumale), 143.
- Mai, Miguel (Charles V's ambassador at Rome), 35.
- Manners, Lady Anne (da. of 1st Earl of Rutland), 55.
- Manners, Henry (Lord Roos, 2nd Earl of Rutland), 55.
- Manners, Thomas (1st Earl of Rutland), 55.
- Margaret Tudor (sister of Henry VIII and wife of James IV of Scotland), 56.
- Markham, Francis, 112-115.
- Marillac, Charles de, 87.
- Marshal of Boulogne, see Ellerkar, Sir Ralph.
- Mary, Princess (Queen Mary), 30, 34-36, 53, 56, 183.
- Mary of Guise, 69.
- Maxse, R. B., 9.
- Maxwell, Robert, Lord (Scottish Warden of the West Marshes), 93.
- Medici, Hippolito de, 234.
- Molaz, 234.
- Montmorency, Anne, Baron de, 40-41.
- Montague, Sir Edward, 206-207.
- More, Sir Thomas, 33.
- Mountjoy, Lord, see Blount, Charles.
- Mowbray, Margaret (da. of Thomas Mowbray, 1st Mowbray Duke of Norfolk), 11.
- Mowbray, John (4th Mowbray Duke of Norfolk), 213.
- Mowbray, John (Earl of Nottingham; son of the following Thomas Mowbray), 213.
- Mowbray, Thomas (1st Mowbray Duke of Norfolk), 11, 213.
- Nash, Thomas, 244, 248.
- Najera, Duke of (Don Juan de Lara), 107-109.

- Neville, Henry, Lord (5th Earl of Westmorland), 55.  
 Neville, Lady Dorothy, 55.  
 Neville, Lady Margaret, 55.  
 Neville, Ralph (4th Earl of Westmorland), 17-18, 55.  
 Norfolk, Dukes of, see Howard, Mowbray.  
 Norfolk, Duchesses of, see Plantagenet, Margaret & Stafford, Lady Elizabeth.  
 Norris, Henry, 54.  
 Nott, George Frederick, 23-24, 36, 100, 107, 234, 236, 237, 248.  
 Oslac, Duke of, 9.  
 Oxford, Earl of, see Vere, John de.  
 Oxford, Countess of ("wydowe" probably of John, 14th Earl), 46.  
 Padelford, F. M., 106, 224, 234, 236, 249.  
 Paget, Sir William, 104, 130, 135, 147, 152, 159-162, 164-170, 174-177, 181-182, 184, 186, 206-207, 214, 216.  
 Palmer, Sir Henry (Master of Ordinance at Boulogne), 155, 157, 181.  
 Palmer, John, 156.  
 Palmer, Sir Thomas (Treasurer of Guines, 1543-1545; Captain of the Old Man at Boulogne, Jan. 1545), 138-141, 145, 147-148, 155, 166.  
 Parker, Jane (wife of George Boleyn, Viscount Rochford), 86.  
 Parr, Catherine, see Catherine.  
 Parr, William (Earl of Essex), 108-109.  
 Paul III, Pope, 51, 70.  
 Paulet, (Poulet) Sir Hugh (Treasurer of Boulogne), 157.  
 Paulet, Sir William (Lord St. John) 206-207, 214.  
 Percy, Lady Eleanor (wife of Duke of Buckingham), 17.  
 Petrarch, 27, 85, 222-223, 227-230, 236, 240.  
 Phillips, Edward, 245.  
 Pickering (or Peking, or Piker), William, 97, 99.  
 Plantagenet, Lady Anne, 16.  
 Plantagenet, Margaret (da. of Thomas de Brotherton; created Duchess of Norfolk; d. 1399), 213.  
 Pole, John de la (Earl of Lincoln), 13-14.  
 Pole, Reginald (Cardinal), 88.  
 Pollard, A. F., 6.  
 Pollard, Sir George, 158.  
 Pollard, Mr. (military man at Boulogne), 143-144, 154.  
 Pope, The, see Clement VII & Paul III.  
 Porter, Mr., see Flammock, Sir Andrew.  
 Poynings, Adrian, 143.  
 Poynings, Edward (Captain of the Guard at Boulogne), 156-157.  
 Poynings, Sir Thomas (created Lord Poynings), 118, 125, 130, 160.  
 Radcliffe, Henry (2nd Earl of Sussex), 121.  
 Rapin-Thoyras, Paul de, 216.  
 Reve, John (Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds), 50, 51.  
 Rich, Sir Richard (1st Baron Rich), 57, 206-207.  
 Richard II, 213.  
 Richard III, 11, 12, 16.  
 Richmond, Duke of, see Fitzroy, Henry.  
 Richmond, Duchess of, see Howard, Mary.  
 Ritson, Joseph, 248.  
 Robertes (a captain at Boulogne), 156.  
 Rochester, Mr. (a military man), 162.  
 Rochford, Viscount of, see Boleyn, George.  
 Rochford, Lady, see Parker, Jane.  
 Roelux, Count de (Adrien de Croy), 118.  
 Rogers, Edward, 197.  
 Rogers, John (Surveyor of Works at Boulogne), 147, 148, 166-169.  
 Roos, Lord, see Manners, Henry.  
 Rosington, John, 175.  
 Russell, John, Lord, 83.  
 Saint John, Lord, see Paulet, Sir William.  
 Salerno, Giovanni de (Colonel of Italians at Boulogne), 165-166, 169-170, 173.  
 Sampson, Richard (Bishop of Chichester), 79.  
 Saintsbury, George, 233.  
 Sannazaro, 27.

- Seymour, Sir Edward (Viscount Beauchamps & Earl of Hertford), 55, 61, 62, 96, 99, 117, 120-123, 125-126, 136, 160-162, 164, 165, 168, 171, 173, 178-180, 183-186, 188-191, 195, 198, 206-207, 214.
- Seymour, Jane, see Jane.
- Seymour, Sir John, 55.
- Seymour, Sir Thomas, 67-68, 83, 179-180, 197-199.
- Shelley, Thomas (once servant to Surrey & a captain at Boulogne), 97, 138-139, 141, 155-156.
- Shelton, Jerome, 22, 135?
- Shelton, Mary (Mrs. Hevingham), 22, 182.
- Sidney, Sir Philip, 85.
- Sinclair or St. Clair, Oliver, of Scotland, 93.
- Skelton, John, 27.
- Smeaton, Mark, 54.
- Spencer (a captain at Boulogne), 156.
- Story (a captain at Boulogne), 156.
- Southampton, Earl of, see Fitzwilliam, William.
- Southwell, Sir Richard, 22, 29, 70, 136?, 150, 167, 176, 181-182, 190-192, 194-195, 208, 211.
- Stafford, Edward (Duke of Buckingham), 16, 18, 25.
- Stafford, Lady Elizabeth (wife of 3rd Duke of Norfolk & mother of Surrey), 16-20, 23-26, 65.
- Stanley, Edward (Earl of Derby), 39, 55.
- Strange, Sir Thomas, 70.
- Strete, William (Stretes, Gillim), 22.
- Strype, John, 22.
- Suffolk, Duke of, see Brandon.
- Surrey, Countess of, see Stafford, Lady Elizabeth & Vere, Frances de.
- Surrey's poetry, 34, 42, 49, 63, 66, 67, 84-85, 93, 94-95, 100-101, 103, 110, 123-124, 163-164, 207-210, 221, 222-243, 244-250.
- Sussex, Earl of, see Radcliffe, Henry.
- Symonds, J. S., 66.
- Tate, Richard, 40.
- Tays, Mons. de, 140.
- Tierney, M. A., 21.
- Tilney, Agnes (2nd wife of 2nd Duke of Norfolk), 80-81, 87.
- Tilney, Elizabeth, 87.
- Tilney, Katherine, 87.
- Tomaso, John (Thomazo or Tomazo, Giovanni, an Italian engineer), 138, 146, 147.
- Tottel, Richard, 236.
- Treasurer of Guines, see Palmer, Sir Thomas.
- Trissino, 234.
- Tudor, Arthur, see Arthur.
- Tudor, Margaret, see Margaret.
- Tunstall, Cuthbert (Bishop of Durham), 74.
- Typerio (military man at Boulogne), 165.
- Under-Marshall at Boulogne, see Wyn-debank, Sir Richard.
- Vawse (Vaux), Mr. (a soldier at Boulogne), 156.
- Vendôme, Duke of (Antione de Bourbon), 121.
- Vere, Frances de (Countess of Surrey, wife of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey), 20, 36-37, 50-52, 64, 106, 107, 135, 163, 178, 195, 219, 240.
- Vere, John de (15th Earl of Oxford), 36, 39, 55, 219.
- Vere, John de (Baron Bulbeck, 16th Earl of Oxford), 55.
- Vervins, Lord de (Jacques de Coucy), 119, 122.
- Wallop, Sir John, 103-105.
- Walpole, Horace, 246-248.
- Warham, Henry (Archbishop of Canterbury), 44.
- Warner, Sir Edward, 196?, 200.
- Warton, Thomas, 69, 248.
- Weever, John, 13.
- Westbury, Dean of, see Barlowe, John.
- Westmorland, Earl of, see Neville, Ralph.
- Weston, Sir Francis, 54.
- Wharton, Sir Thomas, 93.
- Whetnall, Joan, 99.
- William I, 12, 210.

## INDEX

- Winchester, Bishop of, see Gardiner, Stephen.
- Winstanley, William, 245.
- Wourth (a captain at Boulogne), 156.
- Wimes, Comte de, 118.
- Wolsey, Thomas (Cardinal), 25-26, 29, 30-31, 33, 49, 57.
- Wood, Anthony à, 245.
- Worcester, Countess of (wife of Henry Somerset, 2nd Earl of Worcester), 46.
- Wriothlesley, Sir Thomas (Lord Chancellor, Baron Wriothlesley and later Earl of Southampton), 186, 188, 191, 193, 195, 200, 206-207, 214-215.
- Wyatt, Sir Thomas, the Elder, 42, 94, 95, 222-226, 233, 241-245.
- Wyatt, Sir Thomas, the Younger, 97, 99, 140, 145, 147-148, 155-156, 158, 169.
- Wynchcombe (a captain at Boulogne), 156.
- Wyndam, Thomas, 97.
- Wyndebank or Wynneback, Sir Richard (Under-Marshal of Boulogne), 157, 171.